

[\(Link to Table of Contents\)](#)

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

A CLOSER LOOK AT PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance

JANUARY 2004



1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Tel: 803-737-2260 Web: <http://www.che.sc.gov>



Conrad Festa
Executive Director

January 14, 2004

Dear Governor Sanford and Members of the General Assembly:

As South Carolina's only source of comprehensive comparative data on institutional performance on legislated institutional effectiveness measures, *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina: Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance* provides a unique view of the state's public higher education system. The inclusion of historical data on institutional performance, also unique to this document, allows for the evaluation of current performance and change in the context of past performance. In addition to the data contained within this document, links are provided to the institutions' mission statements, institutional effectiveness reports, Title II Teacher Education data reports, and Performance Funding ratings. These data and the linked documents are provided to help inform your deliberations as you consider higher education issues from the state perspective.

In taking this "Closer Look" at higher education, the Commission furthers its primary goal of supporting and coordinating efforts to meet the educational and workforce demands of the people of South Carolina. In compliance with Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, I respectfully submit the following report to the members of the General Assembly.

Sincerely,

Conrad Festa
Executive Director

(blank page)

A CLOSER LOOK AT PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA **Institutional Effectiveness, Accountability, and Performance**

A Publication of the
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Division of Academic Affairs & Licensing
Gail Morrison, Director

Conrad Festa
Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

T. Michael Raley, Editor



1333 Main St., Suite 200
Columbia, SC 29201
803.737.2260 Phone
803.737.2297 Fax
<http://www.che.sc.gov>

Contributing Editor:
Julie C. Wahl (jwahl@che.sc.gov)

(blank page)



COMMISSION MEMBERS

Dalton B. Floyd, Jr., Chair
Governor's Appointment at Large

Rosemary H. Byerly
4th Congressional District Representative

James S. Konduros
2nd Congressional District Representative

Susan R. Cole
Governor's Appointment at Large

Miles Loadholt
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional

Larry Durham
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional

DeLoris H. Oliver
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio Institutional

Douglas R. Forbes
Governor's Appointment at Large

Thomas R. Olsen, Sr.
5th Congressional District Representative

R. Austin Gilbert, Jr.
Governor's Appointment at Large

Daniel Ravenel
1st Congressional District Representative

John V. Griffith
Governor's Appointment Ex-Officio without vote
Private Sector President

Roger E. Stevenson
3rd Congressional District Representative

Vermelle J. Johnson
6th Congressional District Representative

Acknowledgement

The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education extends its sincere gratitude to the institutional representatives who played an essential role in the publication of this report

(blank page)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Index of Charts and Tables</u>	iii
<u>Introduction</u>	1
Institutional Effectiveness Reporting	2
South Carolina Performance Funding System for Higher Education	3
Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina	5
<u>Section 1 Mission Focus</u>	11
Review of Programs	13
Curricula Offered at Institutions	16
Institutional Mission Statements *	20
<u>Section 2 Quality of Faculty</u>	23
Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors	25
Compensation of Faculty by Sector	28
<u>Section 3 Classroom Quality</u>	33
Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and Graduate Assistants *	36
Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs *	38
Student Performance on Teacher Education Exams	41
Teacher Education Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas	42
Teacher Education Graduates Who are Minority	42
Assessment Information for the Institution's Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 Report	43
Graduates' Satisfaction – Alumni Surveys	44
<u>Section 4 Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration</u>	51
<u>Section 5 Administrative Efficiency</u>	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS, *continued*

<u>Section 6</u>	<u>Entrance Requirements</u>	59
	Qualifications of Entering Freshmen	62
	Success of Students in Developmental Courses*	64
	Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students*	65
	Admission Standards	66
<u>Section 7</u>	<u>Graduates' Achievements</u>	69
	Performance Funding Graduation Rate	71
	Southern Regional Education Board Graduation Rate	75
	Student Performance on Professional Examinations *	77
	National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations *	84
	Overall Passing Percentage on Professional Examinations for SC's Public Institutions	87
	Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests	88
	Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education	90
	Graduates' Achievements – Placement Data Surveys	91
<u>Section 8</u>	<u>User-Friendliness of the Institution</u>	95
	First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Transfers *	97
	Enrollment by Race *	99
	Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State	100
<u>Section 9</u>	<u>Research Funding</u>	109
	Student Involvement in Research *	112
	Financial Support for Teacher Education	114
	Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants	116
<u>Section 10</u>	<u>Campus-Based Assessment *</u>	117
	2002 Summary Reports on Institutional Websites	120
<u>Section 11</u>	<u>Institutional Performance Rating Process</u>	123
	Institutional Ratings for 1999-2000 Performance Year	125

Index of Charts and Tables

Section 1	Mission Focus	
Table 1.1	Programs Reviewed During the Academic Year	14
Table 1.2	Program Status at Technical Colleges	15
Table 1.3	Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission	17
Figure 1.1	Performance Indicator 1B-Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission	19
Section 2	Quality of Faculty	
Figure 2.1	Percent of Full-Time Faculty with Terminal Degrees in the Primary Teaching Are	25
Figure 2.2	Percent Teaching in the Fall Who Meet Minimum SACS Degree Criteria for Credentials	27
Figure 2.3	Compensation of Faculty by Sector	28
Section 3	Classroom Quality	
Table 3.1	Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants	37
Figure 3.1	Indicator 3D-Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	38
Table 3.2	Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs	40
Figure 3.2	Student Performance on Teacher Education Examinations: Content/Specialty Area Exam	41
Figure 3.3	Percent of Teacher Education graduates in Critical Shortage Areas	42
Figure 3.4	Percent of Teacher Graduates Who are Minority	43
Table 3.3	Graduate Satisfaction – Alumni Survey	44
Section 4	Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration	
Figure 4.1	Institutional Collaboration and Cooperation	54
Section 6	Entrance Requirements	
Figure 6.1	SAT/ACT Scores, High School Rank and GPA of Student Body	62
Table 6.1	Success of Students in Developmental Courses	64
Table 6.2	Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students	65
Table 6.3	Applications and Admission Offers	66
Figure 6.2	Percent of Applicants Offered Admission who Accepted and Enrolled	66

Index of Charts and Tables, *continued*

Figure 6.3	Average SAT/ACT Combined Scores of all First-Time Entering Freshmen	67
Section 7	Graduates' Achievements	
Figure 7.1	Graduation Rate (Performance Funding)	72
Table 7.1	Graduation Within 150% of Program Time (GRS Rate), Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges	74
Table 7.2	Graduation (SREB)	75
Table 7.3	Student Performance on Professional Examinations	77
Table 7.4	National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations	85
Table 7.5	Overall Pass Rates on Professional Examinations by Year for South Carolina Public Institutions	87
Figure 7.2	Results of Professional Examinations (Performance Funding)	88
Figure 7.3	Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education	90
Section 8	User-Friendliness of the Institution	
Table 8.1	First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Transfers	97
Table 8.2	Enrollment by Race	99
Figure 8.1	Percent of Headcount Undergraduate Students who are Citizens of South Carolina who are Minority	101
Figure 8.2	Retention of Minorities who are South Carolina Citizens and Identified as Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students	103
Figure 8.3	Percent of Headcount Graduate Students Enrolled at the Institution Who are Minority	105
Figure 8.4	Percent of Headcount Teaching Faculty who are Minority	106
Section 9	Research Funding	
Table 9.1	Student Involvement in Research - Graduate Students	112
Table 9.2	Student Involvement in Research - Undergraduate Students	113
Figure 9.1	Financial Support for Teacher Education	115
Figure 9.2	Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants	116

INTRODUCTION

The following publication provides a closer look at data reported annually by South Carolina's public institutions of higher education as part of institutional effectiveness reporting and as part of the process of performance funding. Prior to the January 2000 edition, this document was entitled "Minding Our P's and Q's: Indications of Productivity and Quality in South Carolina Public Colleges and Universities." In January 2000, the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) substantially revised this publication in efforts to provide a source guide integrating data reported by the state's public colleges and universities in fulfillment of legislative requirements.

The CHE integrated institutional effectiveness data reporting with performance data measured pursuant to Section 59-103-30 and Section 59-103-45 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to determine institutional funding levels. Data related to the funding process reflect the 2002-2003 performance year, which resulted in ratings given to institutions in Spring 2003 for the purpose of determining the allocation of FY 2003-2004 state appropriations. Historical performance data are displayed if available. Detailed information related to the performance funding process in South Carolina is available on the CHE's website at <http://www.che.sc.gov>.

Throughout this publication, data are displayed on the 33 public institutions of higher education within groupings of institutions or sectors that have common missions as identified in Act 359 of 1996. However, due to the uniqueness in mission of each individual institution, the reader is cautioned against drawing conclusions and making comparisons solely based on the figures and tables found in this report.

What will you find in this report?

Eleven sections highlight various aspects of higher education. Notations in the "Table of Contents" clearly identify components of this publication that are part of reporting requirements of Section 59-101-350, or what has become commonly referred to as "Act 255" data. Where appropriate, comments in the text explain how these required data elements are utilized as part of annual performance funding measurements.

Sections 1 - 9 reflect the nine "critical success factors" identified by the General Assembly for South Carolina's public colleges and universities (Section 59-103-30). Data from both institutional effectiveness and performance funding reporting are combined in these sections. Often the data is presented by type of institution or sector, as identified in the legislation. The four sectors of institutions as defined in legislation are:

Research Universities,
Four-Year Colleges and Universities,
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of the University of South Carolina, and
State Technical and Comprehensive Education System.

The CHE maintains historical data on institutions and when appropriate, three years of data are presented for comparison.

Section 10, "Campus-Based Assessment," includes a summary of other institutional effectiveness reporting and the web addresses where detailed institutional reports are located.

Section 11 contains each institution's performance ratings as approved by the CHE on June 5, 2003. These ratings affected the allocation of state appropriations for the 2003-2004 fiscal year.

Institutional Effectiveness Reporting

Pursuant to Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, the CHE is required to report specific higher education data "in a readable format so as to easily compare with peer institutions in South Carolina." This report must be submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly prior to January 15th of each year. This information is included throughout the publication and integrated with performance funding measures when applicable.

The information regarding institutional effectiveness reporting required by Section 59-101-350 is found below.

Four-Year Institutions

- The number and percentage of accredited programs and the number and percentage of programs eligible for accreditation;
- The number and percentage of undergraduate and graduate students who completed their degree program;
- The percent of lower division instructional courses taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants;
- The percent and number of students enrolled in remedial courses and the number of students exiting remedial courses and successfully completing entry-level curriculum courses;
- The percent of graduate and upper division undergraduate students participating in sponsored research programs;
- Placement data on graduates;
- The percent change in the enrollment rate of students from minority groups and the change in the total number of minority students enrolled over the past five years;
- The percent of graduate students who received undergraduate degrees at the institution, within the State, within the United States, and from other nations;
- The number of full-time students who have transferred from a two-year, post-secondary institution and the number of full-time students who have transferred to two-year, post-secondary institutions;
- Student scores on professional examinations with detailed information on state and national means, passing scores, and pass rates, as available, and with information on such scores over time, and the number of students taking each exam;
- Assessment information for the institution's Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 report that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and the performance of the candidates and graduates;
- Appropriate information relating to each institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce;

- Any information required by the commission in order for it to measure and determine the institution's standard of achievement in regard to the performance indicators for quality academic success enumerated in Section 59-103-30.

Two-Year Institutions

- The number and percentage of accredited programs and the number and percentage of programs eligible for accreditation;
- The number and percentage of undergraduate students who completed their degree program;
- The percent of courses taught by full-time faculty members, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants;
- Placement rate on graduates;
- The percent change in the enrollment rate of students from minority groups, the number of minority students enrolled and the change in the total number of minority students enrolled over the past five years;
- The number of students who have transferred into a four-year, post-secondary institution and the number of students who have transferred from four-year, post-secondary institutions;
- Appropriate information relating to the institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce;
- Any information required by the commission in order for it to measure and determine the institution's standard of achievement in regard to the performance indicators for quality academic success enumerated in Section 59-103-30.

South Carolina's Performance Funding System for Higher Education

Act 359 of 1996, commonly referred to as the "Performance Funding Legislation," dramatically changed the responsibilities of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) concerning how public institutions of higher education are funded. The legislation required that the CHE allocate state appropriations to South Carolina's public institutions of higher education based on their performance in nine areas or "critical success factors." The General Assembly identified several performance indicators that could be used, if applicable to a particular type of institution, in assessing institutions' successes in achieving performance in each of the areas. In all, 37 performance indicators spread across the nine critical success factors are specified. The CHE was assigned the responsibility of developing and implementing a system for basing funding on institutional performance and for defining how each of the specified indicators would be measured. The General Assembly provided for a 3-year phase-in period for implementing a system to provide 100% of available state funding on institutional performance.

In compliance with its legislative mandate, the CHE, in cooperation with South Carolina's higher education institutions and other stakeholders in the state's public higher education system, developed a system for determining institutions' funding based on performance across the nine critical success factors using the 37 performance indicators as applicable.

The system for determining funding has two major components: 1) a determination of financial needs for the institution and 2) a process for rating the institution based on performance across the indicators.

The first component, the determination of need (Mission Resource Requirement), identifies the total amount of money an institution should receive based on nationally and regionally comparable costs for institutions of similar mission, size and complexity of programs and by the prior year's level of appropriation.

The second component, the performance rating, is determined by assessing whether or not the institution meets, exceeds, or falls short of standards for each indicator. Standards are set either for the individual institution or for institutions within the same sector and are approved annually by the CHE. Each year, the institution is rated on its success in meeting the standards on each of the indicators. These ratings are totaled and expressed as an average score for the institution. Higher scoring institutions will receive a proportionally greater share of available state funding.

The CHE is in its seventh year of implementation and is continually working to refine and improve the performance measurement of South Carolina's public higher education institutions. As might be expected, in the seven years since the passage of Act 359 of 1996, the CHE has made revisions and refinements to the overall system as well as to various measures as strengths and weaknesses have been identified. Details related to scoring and measurement of indicators have varied each year, making comparisons across performance rating years difficult.

Performance Year 6 (2001-2002) saw the most extensive changes to date in the measurement of the nine Critical Success Factors designated in Act 359. The changes, approved by the CHE in February, 2001, were based on three general experience-based lessons:

- There is a common core of critical indicators which is applicable to all sectors. Indicators in this core are measured every year for all institutions.
- There are indicators which are mission-specific to the different sectors defined by the Legislature. Sector specific measures have been defined for these indicators.
- Some indicators were either duplicate measures of similar data; measures of indicators that, once achieved, were unlikely to change on a year-to-year basis; or measures that would be more effective if they were combined.

This edition of *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina* reflects these changes in the performance funding measures.

In Section 11 of this report, the reader will find for each institution the ratings used in determining the allocation of the 2003-2004 state appropriations and information related to scoring institutional performance.

The CHE publishes a Performance Funding Workbook that outlines, in detail, all of the performance indicators, how they have been defined, and to whom they apply. The workbook is provided as a guide to be used by institutions. It is also useful to others interested in the performance funding system in South Carolina as it details the measurement and rating system in its entirety. The workbook is published annually.

Development of Standards

In Performance Year 5 (2000-01 to impact FY 2001-02 state allocations) the CHE approved for three years sector specific common standards that the CHE staff together with institutional representatives had developed. A range of acceptable performance was determined for each indicator. Institutions performing within the range earn a rating of "Achieves," equal to a numerical score of "2." Performance that is above the range earns a rating of "Exceeds," equal to a numerical score of "3," and performance below the range earns a rating of "Does Not Achieve," equal to a numerical score of "1." (Two indicators, 5D and 7F, reverse the direction.) The standards allow for a broad range of performance to achieve the standard and a demanding level of performance to exceed the standard. An institution's performance on an indicator in the range of "Does Not Achieve" or "Achieves" could receive an additional 0.5 performance point if its performance showed significant improvement over its past average performance, as approved by the CHE. The percentage improvement standard varies by indicator, reflecting the type of data being measured. In most cases, an institution must show either a 3% or 5% improvement of the average performance over the past three years. These standards have remained in place through Performance Year 7, covered by this report.

The scoring standards are based, where possible, on peer data. When peer data is not available, standards have been based on the best available data, including national and state data. If directly comparable data were unavailable at the time standards were developed, estimated data based on sources that may not be directly comparable were considered. When applicable, figures and tables in this document state the standard necessary for an institution to receive a score of "Achieves."

Strategic Plan for Higher Education in South Carolina

In the spring of 2001, the Commission initiated the process of revising the South Carolina's strategic plan for public higher education. Through a series of meetings of the Planning Advisory Council, and with input from all areas of higher education, the Council of Presidents and the Commission, a plan was developed and refined. The plan was approved by the Commission on January 10, 2002. The text of the approved plan follows.

Vision

South Carolina's system of public and private higher education will address the needs of the state by

- Creating a well-educated citizenry,
- Raising the standard of living of South Carolinians,
- Improving the quality of life,
- Meeting changing work force needs,
- Creating economic development opportunities,
- Positioning the state to be competitive in a global economy, and
- Fashioning a new generation of public sector and private sector leaders.

Introduction

During the last decade, the state has made significant strides in improving the quality of and access to higher education. The technical colleges have earned a well-deserved reputation for the excellence of their technical and occupational programs and for their responsiveness to the needs of business. They have also positioned themselves to serve as an entry point into higher education for increasing numbers of students. The state's technical colleges and two-year regional campuses have provided greater access to a wide array of university programs at sites across the state. The four-year institutions have developed new programs and strengthened their academic offerings. The state's research universities have expanded their graduate and high technology offerings, increased their admission criteria, and garnered greater external support for research and technology.

Yet the growth in state support for higher education has been at best modest, straining public college and university resources. All of South Carolina's higher education institutions, both public and private, have struggled to achieve greater efficiencies and have shifted increasing percentages of their spending to support academic programs. As a result, they operate on lean administrative budgets that are well below national averages for per-student expenditures.

Even so, colleges and universities have had to raise tuition and fees, causing students and their parents to pay a higher price for higher education. Tuition charges for the state's public colleges and universities are consistently among the highest in the sixteen-state southeast region.

Help has come from the state in the form of dramatic increases in scholarship assistance for those students who qualify. Those who do not qualify, however, face a widening gap between costs and their ability to pay. The prospect of tuition assistance for students enrolled at two-year institutions can provide an avenue into higher education for many of these students but poses problems for the two-year institutions in meeting potential enrollment increases. Tuition covers only 25% of the operational cost per student. With projected enrollment increases of up to 20%, long-term funding for the two-year campuses must take the gap between tuition and costs into account.

Adding to the enrollment pressure is a projected increase in the number of high school graduates and an increase in the percentage of these graduates who will be prepared for college. More traditional and non-traditional students will expect to matriculate in the state's colleges and universities. This projected enrollment growth also increases the pressure for additional capital projects to accommodate the greater number of students.

Faced with greater demand for services and fewer state resources, the state's colleges and universities are finding it difficult to compete with the best institutions in other states. South Carolina's best college teachers are tempted to leave the state for higher paying positions in more supportive environments. The best researchers are attracted to research universities in other states that provide better equipment and facilities and greater opportunities to collaborate on cutting-edge projects.

Clearly, in South Carolina more state resources are needed for higher education. At the same time, state budget projections point to several years of belt-tightening, with possible reductions in allocations for state colleges and universities. Even after this period of budget adjustments, the state will face continued competing demands for limited resources. Social services, early childhood education, K-12 education, health care, prisons, roads, and other needs will crowd the legislative agenda. As a result, in South Carolina the prospects for adequate state funding for colleges and universities are not good.

In this environment of constricted resources and increasing demands, higher education in South Carolina finds itself at a crossroads. If the state is to compete nationally and globally, it must have a well-educated citizenry capable of working productively and sustaining and enjoying a higher quality of life. Yet, South Carolina is a small state and a comparatively poor one. If it is to provide high quality higher education opportunities, it has significant challenges to overcome.

Adversity can lead to positive outcomes. South Carolina can meet its challenges in higher education, but to do so it must marshal its resources and launch a concerted and collaborative effort to focus those resources strategically.

Policy makers need to establish priorities and work to have them funded. Institutions need to "work smart" to make up for what they lack in resources. The state must make smart choices for the future of its citizens.

In this environment, the following strategic plan sets forth the strategic directions for higher education in South Carolina.

Environmental Factors

As South Carolina moves resolutely through the first decade of the twenty-first century, it must be prepared to negotiate the following demographic and environmental realities that will affect higher education:

- South Carolina's population increased by 15.1% for 1990-2000, compared to the national percentage change of 13.2%, which will cause increased demands for access to higher education;
- The college-going rate for South Carolina high school graduates has increased from 51.9% in 1989 to 61.8% in 1999, adding to the increased population of college-bound students;
- Minorities represent only 26% of the population attending college in South Carolina, compared to 33% of the total population of the state, and receive less than 15% of the state scholarship dollars, underscoring disparities in college attendance rates and scholarship support;
- The state lottery is projected to cover the cost of tuition at the state's two-year colleges, providing opportunities for students but also straining campus resources;

- State funding for higher education has declined from 16.5% of the state's budget in 1990 to 15.3% in 2000, and shortfalls in revenue projections and competing demands for state resources make it likely this figure will decline further;
- Workforce shortages are increasing in such fields as information technology, manufacturing technology, nursing, and teaching, suggesting the need to target educational resources to meet workforce demands;
- While the state population will continue to increase, growth will be uneven, leaving predominantly rural areas of the state without the benefit of economic development and exacerbating the gap between local tax revenues and local needs for services; and,
- Despite economic gains, South Carolina (82.5%) ranks last among its neighboring states of North Carolina (91.1%), Virginia (104.4%), Georgia (95.8%), and Florida (97.3%) in percentage of national average per capita income.

These and other demographic and environmental factors make it clear that South Carolina must act promptly and strategically to strengthen key aspects of its higher education system.

Strategic Goals

To meet the challenges to higher education in South Carolina, the state's public and private colleges and universities and the Commission on Higher Education need to join forces to advance a common agenda. The needs of the state will not be met by fragmented or redundant efforts.

The following three strategic initiatives-to increase access to higher education, to develop a nationally competitive research agenda, and to create collaborative partnerships-provide common ground upon which the state's colleges and universities can address the state's needs.

1. Expand Educational Opportunities for South Carolina Citizens

As South Carolina takes steps to increase the number high school graduates who are prepared for college, the higher education community needs to develop strategies to accommodate an increased number of students. Particular emphasis should be placed on meeting the needs of traditionally under-served populations including first generation college students, minorities, students from low-income families, and adult learners. Students who have not traditionally thought of attending college should be encouraged to do so. All qualified students should feel empowered to enroll in college, to upgrade their skills and increase their knowledge, to progress from two-year colleges to four-year colleges and universities if they have the ability and desire, and to access continuing educational opportunities throughout their lives. The following goals are identified to provide increased educational opportunities for South Carolina's citizens:

- A. Expand services and promote innovative approaches to reach traditionally underserved populations, including adult learners and minority students;
- B. Promote development of distance education courses and programs and virtual library resources to reach students who may not be able to access traditional educational programs;
- C. Increase need-based grants and other scholarship resources to provide increased opportunities for lower income students; and
- D. Improve articulation of two-year and four-year programs to facilitate transfer of students and increase access to baccalaureate programs.

2. Invest in Research for Economic Development and a Better Quality of Life

A cornerstone of economic development is high-level, globally competitive research. Investments in cutting edge research in engineering, health sciences, physical sciences, information systems, environmental sciences, and similar fields yield dividends many times over. Top quality research activity attracts top caliber faculty, who in turn attract funded support from federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation as well as private research support from industries ranging from pharmaceuticals to software and e-business firms to state-of-the-art manufacturing. New and expanding industries locate in states where research is taking place, creating jobs and stimulating higher educational levels in the population. Much as the Research Triangle has stimulated economic development in North Carolina, so too can research investment in South Carolina spur greater economic growth and benefit the people of the state. Such development takes conscious planning and strategic implementation and should be reflected in the state's strategic plan for higher education.

It also takes a commitment to invest the state's resources in ways that will benefit the state exponentially in years to come. The following strategic goals are identified to strengthen the state's investment in higher education research for economic development and a better quality of life:


- A. Create a state incentive system to encourage institutions to recruit nationally recognized faculty who can develop and/or strengthen graduate research programs.
- B. Designate focus areas for research and graduate program excellence and provide funding incentives for them to attain national and international standing.
- C. Support and develop research directed at the economic, social and educational infrastructure of the state drawing from shared data sources and collaborative efforts with other state agencies and private entities.
- D. Create programs to strengthen the quality of teaching and learning as the foundation for the state's future scholars and researchers.

3. Increase Cooperation and Collaboration for Efficiency and Quality

At one time higher education might have taken place in an "ivory tower" divorced from other institutions and other concerns. That clearly is no longer the case. In an age of rapidly increasing needs for a more highly educated citizenry, and in an age, too, when there are strong competing demands for the state's resources and real limits on available state funding, it is incumbent on higher education to seek and to expand cooperative relationships. Greater cooperation and coordination between preK-12 education and higher education can lead to shared use of resources, more closely meshed educational planning, better trained teachers and administrators, more closely linked academic programs, better prepared students entering colleges, and the development of effective data bases to track student progress and assess the effectiveness of education in meeting the state's needs. Likewise, enhanced collaboration with business and industry can insure that economic development needs are met, that educational programs remain on the cutting edge of technological advances, and that education is grounded in real world experiences for students and faculty. Finally, increased cooperation among colleges, universities, state agencies, and non-profit entities can result in demonstrable efficiencies and increased quality. The following strategic goals provide an agenda of increased collaborative activity for higher education in South Carolina:

- A. Develop collaborative programs with the business community, state agencies, and non-profit corporations to enhance economic development and the quality of life.
- B. Increase both the use of and the technology for sharing data and systems among higher education institutions and with other state agencies and the private sector.
- C. Form partnerships with school districts and state agencies to enhance the preparation and continuing training of teachers, the quality of education in the state's public schools, the preparation for school of the state's children, and the support available to students while they are in K-12 schools.
- D. Collaborate with local communities and state and local governments to improve the training of health and social service professionals and the delivery of public health and welfare programs.

Section 1 Mission Focus



(blank page)

MISSION FOCUS

The first critical success factor listed in Act 359 of 1996 is “Mission Focus.” The relevant performance funding indicators for this critical success factor are:

- 1B - Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission;
- 1C - Approval of Mission Statement;
- 1D/E - Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement;
Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan.

The General Assembly in Act 359 of 1996 has determined the following missions for each sector:

Research institutions

- college-level baccalaureate education, master's, professional, and doctor of philosophy degrees which lead to continued education or employment;
- research through the use of government, corporate, nonprofit-organization grants, or state resources, or both;
- public service to the State and the local community;

Four-year colleges and universities

- college-level baccalaureate education and selected master's degrees which lead to employment or continued education, or both, except for doctoral degrees currently being offered;
- limited and specialized research;
- public service to the State and the local community;

Two-year institutions - branches of the University of South Carolina

- college-level pre-baccalaureate education necessary to confer associates' degrees which lead to continued education at a four-year or research institution;
- public service to the State and the local community;

State technical and comprehensive education system

- all post-secondary vocational, technical, and occupational diploma and associate degree programs leading directly to employment or maintenance of employment and associate degree programs which enable students to gain access to other post-secondary education;
- up-to-date and appropriate occupational and technical training for adults;
- special school programs that provide training for prospective employees for prospective and existing industry in order to enhance the economic development of South Carolina;
- public service to the State and the local community;
- continue to remain technical, vocational, or occupational colleges with a mission as stated above and primarily focused on technical education and the economic development of the State.

Review of Programs

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE), through its Division of Academic Affairs, has reviewed existing academic programs to ensure the quality and integrity of degree-granting programs in the public higher education sector. In its broadest context, program review serves as an instrument for gauging the health of the state's academic programs as well as a strategic planning device for determining the present and future needs of specific discipline areas (i.e., new program development)

throughout South Carolina. Program review was incorporated into performance funding for the first time during the 1999-00 performance year as part of Indicator 1B – Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission, which is detailed following the discussion regarding program review.

Program Review of Senior-Level Institutions

The CHE has placed programs at the senior institutions it reviews on eight-year cycles. The cycles were developed in consultation with the chief academic officers of the colleges and universities and are categorized using broad descriptors (i.e. English, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, etc.).

Measuring the success of academic programs has been a complex and multifaceted task.

Consequently, the CHE has reviewed a broad range of source materials concerning each academic program under review. The CHE has drawn from qualitative as well as quantitative data so as to formulate a comprehensive picture of the health of individual programs. It then makes statewide determinations as to the quality of the discipline in South Carolina based largely on the cumulative evaluation of individual programs and on other relevant data.

The following table outlines the disciplines that have been reviewed for the senior institutions over the last 6 years. For a complete description of this process, see the CHE’s “Guidelines for the Review of Existing Academic Programs” at: <http://www.che400.state.sc.us/web/Adm/a4.htm>

Table 1.1 Programs Reviewed During the Academic Year as Part of CHE’s Program Review Process, SC Public 4-Year Institutions Source: CHE Academic Affairs Division

<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>SC Public 4-Year Institutions with Programs in the Area Listed at Left</u>
<u>1996 – 97</u>	Architecture	Clemson
	Dentistry	MUSC
	Health Sciences	Clemson, USC Columbia, MUSC, Francis Marion ¹ , Lander ¹ , SC State, Winthrop ¹
<u>1997-98</u>	English	Clemson, USC Columbia, The Citadel, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Aiken, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop
	Life Sciences	Clemson, USC Columbia, MUSC, The Citadel, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Aiken, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop
<u>1998-99</u>	Teacher Education	Clemson, USC Columbia, The Citadel, Coastal Carolina, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Aiken, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop
<u>1999-2000</u>	Business	Clemson, USC Columbia, The Citadel, Coastal Carolina, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Aiken, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop
	Foreign Languages	Clemson, USC Columbia, The Citadel, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop
	Home Economics	SC State, Winthrop
	Nursing	Clemson, USC Columbia, MUSC, Lander, SC State, USC Aiken, USC Spartanburg
<u>2000-2001</u>	Computer Science	Clemson, USC Columbia, the Citadel, Coastal Carolina, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, Lander, SC State, USC Spartanburg, Winthrop,
	Engineering and Engineering Tech	Clemson, USC Columbia, The Citadel, Francis Marion, SC State
<u>2001-2002</u>		
<u>2003-2003</u>		

¹ Program reviewed has been incorporated into a program in the life sciences area subsequent to the review in 1996-97.

Program Review of the USC Regional Campuses and the Technical College System

This review begins with associate degree programs found in the University of South Carolina’s regional campuses and then proceeds to the much larger and more varied set of associate degree programs offered in the State’s 16 technical colleges. The procedures for this annual review require each program’s productivity to be evaluated in terms of enrollment, number of graduates, and percent of graduates placed in a related job or continuing their studies full-time. The purpose is twofold: 1) to ensure that programs to be continued are responsive to employment trends and meet minimum standards; and 2) to identify programs which need to be strengthened.

Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC

All of the 4 two-year regional campuses of USC offer the Associate of Arts/Associate of Science degree programs. Each of the AA/AS programs at these campuses is enrolling and graduating students in satisfactory numbers. Based on the CHE’s “Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs Report,” FY 2002-2003, the number of degree completers in these programs is satisfactory.

Of the two-year regional campuses of USC, only USC Lancaster offers applied two-year technical degrees. Additional programs at USC Lancaster include nursing (joint program with York Tech), criminal justice, and business. Since a merger of two under-performing business related programs at the campus in June 1995, the combined business program has met the criterion for “good” for both enrollments and graduation rates.

State Technical and Comprehensive Education System

This review is administered and reported to the CHE by the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education each year. All of the institutions’ associate degree programs are rated and placed in a category, as shown below, based on enrollment, number of graduates, and percent of graduates placed in a related job or continuing their studies full-time. The following criteria apply:

- 1) Each program must produce at least 6 graduates during the evaluation year or an average of at least 6 graduates over the most recent 3-year period;
- 2) At the most recent Fall term, each program must enroll at least 16 students who generate 12 full-time equivalents; and
- 3) At least 50% of the graduates available for job placement must be placed in a job related to their education or continue their education on a full-time basis.

Programs that fail to meet the above criteria must be canceled, suspended, or put on probation unless their continuation is justified to the CHE.

Table 1.2 Program Status at Technical Colleges

Source: CHE Division of Academic Affairs Annual Evaluation of Associate Degree Programs, FY 2001-2002

Institution	Good			Good-Justified			Probation			Suspended			Canceled		
	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
Aiken	8	10	13	2	2	-	4	2	3	-	1	1	-	-	-
Central Carolina	13	12	16	2	2	-	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	8	8	11	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florence-Darlington	21	20	22	2	2	-	2	2	4	-	1	-	-	1	1

Institution	Good			Good-Justified			Probation			Suspended			Canceled		
	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002	2000	2001	2002
Greenville	27	28	34	2	2	-	4	3	1	0	1	2	1	-	-
Horry-Georgetown	15	16	20	2	2	-	1	-	1	2	3	2	1	-	-
Midlands	21	22	26	2	3	1	7	4	2	-	1	3	2	2	-
Northeastern	6	6	9	2	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
Orangeburg-Calhoun	12	14	17	2	2	-	3	1	1	2	-	-	2	4	-
Piedmont	17	17	21	3	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Spartanburg	16	16	21	4	3	-	5	3	3	1	2	1	-	2	1
TCL	8	9	11	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Tri-County	16	16	18	3	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	-
Trident	24	25	28	2	2	1	1	3	3	1	-	-	2	2	-
Williamsburg	3	2	5	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
York	15	14	20	3	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	1	-
Total	230	235	292	34	34	2	29	22	26	7	9	10	14	14	2

Curricula Offered at Institutions

Performance Funding Indicator 1B – Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission is based on the institution’s approved mission statement and measures as the percentage of “degree programs” which:

- 1) are appropriate to the degree-level authorized for the institution by the CHE and Act 359 of 1996
- 2) support the institutions’ goals, purpose, and objectives as defined in the approved mission statement; and
- 3) have received “full approval” in the most recent CHE review of that program.

Research and Teaching Sector Institutions: The measure applies to MUSC and 4-year institutions, except USC Beaufort in Year 7, as a scored indicator in which a resulting percentage is determined and that percentage is scored against numeric standards of achievement as approved by the CHE. All three criteria listed in the above measure apply. For USC Beaufort, a transition "compliance" indicator is used; see 2002 Workbook, Section II.D pp. 195-200. For the past performance year, institutions with performance from 95% to 99%, or all but one program not meeting each criteria, earned a score of “Achieves” or “2.”

Degree Programs are those approved by the CHE as listed in the Inventory of Academic Programs as of February 2003, for purposes of determining Year 7, 2002-03, performance. To determine performance, degree programs are counted at the level of the degree designation (e.g., BA, BS, MA, and PhD). Degree programs offered at multiple sites by an institution are counted once. For example, an institution offers a BS in French at its campus and another off-site location, the BS in French is counted as one program). An exception to this general rule is made when CHE program reviews are conducted at the "option-level" of a degree. In such cases, each option reviewed is counted. For example, if an institution offers a BA degree in Secondary Education with options in English, History and Social Studies and the areas were reviewed separately, then the 3, not 1, degree programs would be counted. However, if the Secondary Education degree program were reviewed as a whole, then it would count as one program. To date, this exception has applied primarily to teacher education programs.

CHE Program Reviews considered here apply to MUSC and 4-year institutions. Reviews since 1995-96 and the status of those reviews as of March 2003 are considered. The results of past reviews updated to the current status based on actions taken by institutions and approved by CHE for addressing cases are included as well as the initial result of reviews completed since the last performance measurement. Reviews completed since the last measurement that are considered for the first time in determining performance this year include Computer Science. Past program reviews include: 1995-96 reviews of Library Science, Physical Science and Visual and Performing Arts; 1996-97 reviews of Architecture, Dentistry and Health Sciences; and 1997-98 reviews of English and Life Sciences, 1998-99 Business, Teacher Education, Family and Consumer Sciences, and Foreign Languages, 2000-01 Nursing and Engineering/Engineering Technology.

Because program review for the two-year public institutions is quantitative rather than qualitative in nature, part 3 of indicator 1B does not apply to the regional campuses of USC or the technical colleges. For these institutions, performance on Indicator 1B is assessed by determining the percentage of programs offered by an institution meeting the first two criteria. Those at 100% earn compliance on this indicator.

The resulting numbers and percentages shown in the following table (Table 1.4, next page) for Indicator 1B are based on the Inventory of Academic Programs and program review activity as of the year assessed. The Commission’s Division of Academic Affairs is responsible for maintaining the inventory that details the programs offered by institutions.

Table 1.3 Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission

Source: Data compiled based on data from CHE Division of Academic Affairs Inventory of Programs and Annual Program Review

Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission, Summary of Indicator 1B						
As assessed in Spring 2003 for ratings impacting FY 2003-04						
(Program Review Activity as of March, 2003 for Programs Reviewed 1995-96 to 2001-2002)						
Research and Teaching Sector Institutions	# Meeting All Criteria	Total # of Programs	% Meeting All Criteria Yr 7 Performance	# meeting criterion 1	# meeting criterion 2	# meeting criterion 3* ()= number of programs with full approval of number reviewed
Clemson	199	199	100%	199	199	199 (131 of 131)
USC Columbia	327	327	100%	327	327	327 (205 of 205)
MUSC	42	42	100%	42	42	42 (26 of 26)
The Citadel	43	44	98%	44	44	43 (33 of 34)
Coastal Carolina University	36	36	100%	36	36	36 (17 of 17)
College of Charleston	128	128	100%	128	128	128 (91 of 91)

**Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission, Summary of Indicator 1B
As assessed in Spring 2003 for ratings impacting FY 2003-04**

(Program Review Activity as of March, 2003 for Programs Reviewed 1995-96 to 2001-2002)

Research and Teaching Sector Institutions	# Meeting All Criteria	Total # of Programs	% Meeting All Criteria Yr 7 Performance	# meeting criterion 1	# meeting criterion 2	# meeting criterion 3* ()= number of programs with full approval of number reviewed
Francis Marion University	55	55	100%	55	55	55 (37 of 37)
Lander University	40	40	100%	40	40	40 (21 of 21)
SC State University	86	90	96%	90	90	86 (73 of 77)
USC Aiken	30	30	100%	30	30	30 (15 of 15)
USC Beaufort **	n/a	n/a	n/a in Yr 7	n/a	n/a	n/a
USC Spartanburg	48	48	100%	48	48	48 (27 of 27)
Winthrop University	94	94	100%	94	94	94 (63 of 63)

* "# Meeting Criteria 3" include those with full approval plus all programs not reviewed to date. The bracketed information, to the right of the number indicating the number of programs meeting the criteria, indicates the "# of programs reviewed with full approval" of the "# of programs reviewed."

**USC Beaufort was approved as a four-year degree granting institution in July 2002. A transition indicator applies.


2-Year Institutions	# Meeting All Criteria	Total # of Programs	Compliance If All Programs Meet Applicable Criteria Yr 7 Performance
USC Lancaster	5	5	Compliance
USC Salkehatchie	2	2	Compliance
USC Sumter	2	2	Compliance
USC Union	2	2	Compliance
Aiken Tech	18	18	Compliance
Central Carolina Tech	17	17	Compliance
Denmark Tech	11	11	Compliance
Florence-Darlington Tech	26	26	Compliance
Greenville Tech	34	34	Compliance
Horry-Georgetown Tech	23	23	Compliance
Midlands Tech	30	30	Compliance

2-Year Institutions	# Meeting All Criteria	Total # of Programs	Compliance If All Programs Meet Applicable Criteria Yr 7 Performance
Northeastern Tech	9	9	Compliance
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	23	23	Compliance
Piedmont Tech	23	23	Compliance
Spartanburg Tech	21	21	Compliance
Tech Coll. of the Low Country	13	13	Compliance
Tri-County Tech	20	20	Compliance
Trident Tech	31	31	Compliance
Williamsburg Tech	5	5	Compliance
York Tech	20	20	Compliance


Figure 1.1 Performance Indicator 1B – Curricula Offered to Achieve Mission

Source: Data compiled by CHE Division of Planning, Assessment and Performance Funding based on data from CHE Division of Academic Affairs Inventory of Programs and Annual Program Review

Research Institutions – For Year 7 (2002 -2003) scores, a performance level of 95% - 99% or, if <95%, all but 1 meeting the criteria was required in order to score “Achieves.”



Teaching Institutions – For Year 7 (2002 -2003) scores, a performance level of 95% - 99%, or if <95%, all but 1 meeting the criteria was required in order to score “Achieves.” This was a “Compliance” indicator for USC Beaufort in Year 7 (2002-2003), which was in compliance based on timely activity in seeking CHE program approvals.



Two-year Regional Branches of USC and Technical Colleges – Indicator 1B is a compliance indicator for these institutions. All scored in compliance in Year 7 (2002-2003).

Indicator 1C – Mission Statements

Each institution currently has a Commission on Higher Education (CHE) approved mission statement, as required by **Indicator 1C – Approval of Mission Statement**. Revised statements are reviewed by the CHE for approval as they are submitted by the institutions. Each institution's mission statement, as approved by the CHE, can be accessed through the web pages listed below or through the CHE's web site at <http://www.che400.state.sc.us>.

Institutional Mission Statements

Research Institutions

Clemson University	http://www.clemson.edu/welcome/quickly/mission/index.htm
University of South Carolina- Columbia Campus	http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/99fact/cmission99.htm
University System	http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/99fact/umission99.htm
Medical University of South Carolina	http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc_mission

Four-Year Colleges and Universities

The Citadel	http://www.citadel.edu/academicaffairs/mission.html
Coastal Carolina University	http://www.coastal.edu/about/mission.html
College of Charleston	http://www.cofc.edu/about/mission.html
Francis Marion University	http://www.fmarion.edu/~instresearch/statemen1.htm
Lander University	http://www.lander.edu/mission.html
South Carolina State University	http://www.scsu.edu/aboutscsu/mission.htm
USC Aiken	http://www.usca.edu/aboutusca/missionwords.html
USC Beaufort	http://www.sc.edu/beaufort/facts/factcont.shtml
USC Spartanburg	http://www.uscs.edu/about_uscs/mission.html
Winthrop University	http://www.winthrop.edu/president/mission.htm

Regional Campuses

USC Lancaster	http://www.sc.edu/lancaster/planning/Perfind99.htm
USC Salkehatchie	http://www.sc.edu/bulletin/archives/2002-2003/Salkehatchie/The_Univ.html
USC Sumter	http://www.uscsumter.edu/campus_services/admin/strategic.htm
USC Union	http://www.sc.edu/union/inform/mission.htm

State Technical and Comprehensive Education System

Aiken Tech	http://www.aik.tec.sc.us/thecollege_vision.htm
Central Carolina Tech	http://www.cctech.edu/about/mission.asp
Denmark Tech	http://dte401.den.tec.sc.us:8000/mission.html
Florence-Darlington Tech	http://www.flo.tec.sc.us/geninfo/college_mission.htm
Greenville Tech	http://www.greenvilletech.com/About/mission_statement.html

Horry-Georgetown Tech	http://www.hor.tec.sc.us/gen/mission.htm
Midlands Tech	http://www.midlandstech.com/mission.htm
Northeastern Tech	http://www.netc.edu/GeneralInfo1.html
Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	http://www.octech.org/about/aboutOCTC.html
Piedmont Tech	http://www.piedmont.tec.sc.us/geninfo/mission.htm
Spartanburg Tech Technical College of the Low Country	http://www.stcsc.edu/annualimprove/2000-2001/2002-2003_aip_cover.htm
Tri-County Tech	http://www.tclonline.org/missionstmt.html
Trident Tech	http://www.tctc.edu/2.html#mission
Williamsburg Tech	http://www.tridenttech.edu/mission.html
York Tech	http://www.williamsburgtech.com/mission.htm
	http://www.yorktech.com/catalog/college.htm#mission

**Indicator 1D/E – Adoption of a Strategic Plan to Support the Mission Statement;
Attainment of Goals of the Strategic Plan Performance Indicator.**

This indicator is defined for each institution through the submission of individual goals by the institutions and their approval by the Commission. Each institution sets annual performance criteria for scoring purposes for the three-year goal. In October of 2002, the institutions reported on their success in reaching their annual performance level on this indicator for Year 7. The reported achievements were compared with the institution’s criteria for a score of “Achieves” and scored accordingly. Of the 33 institutions, three scored at the “Achieves” level and the rest scored an “Exceeds.” As each institution has unique goals and scoring criteria, comparison charts are not presented.

Academic programs to provide a technologically skilled workforce


In 2001, the South Carolina Legislature amended Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, to include the following as an Institutional Effectiveness reporting requirement.

Appropriate information relating to the institution's role and mission to include policies and procedures to ensure that academic programs support the economic development needs in the State by providing a technologically skilled workforce. (added text underlined.)

The institutions of the state have included a section relating to the above requirement in their Institutional Effectiveness Reports. Links to these reports are found in Section 10 of this document.

(blank page)

Section 2 Quality of Faculty



(blank page)

QUALITY OF FACULTY

The second critical success factor in performance funding looks at the quality of faculty at South Carolina's public institutions. Indicators used to assess this factor in Year 7 are:


- 2A - Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors;
- 2D - Compensation of Faculty;

Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors

Indicator 2A, “Academic and Other Credentials of Professors and Instructors,” is a measure of the academic credentials of faculty. Prior to Year 6, the measure of 2A consisted of multiple subparts, each considering credentials of faculty teaching undergraduates. In Year 6, the measure was redefined to provide a better focus for each sector. Research, Teaching, and Regional Campuses Sector Institutions are measured on the percent of full-time faculty with a terminal degree in their primary teaching area. Technical Colleges are measured on the percent of faculty teaching in the Fall who meet minimum SACS criteria for credentials. Standards of achievement vary across the sectors and are indicated in the charts below. Additional detail and definitions can be found in the Performance Funding Workbook, September 2002.

Figure 2.1 Source: CHEMIS and Institutional Reports to CHE Research Universities, Fall 2002


2A - Percentage of full-time faculty with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area.



For Year 7, affecting funding in 2002-2003, a standard of 75 - 84% earned a score of "Achieves" for 2A. In Year 7, this indicator did not include Instructors for the Research and Teaching sectors. The figures for Fall, 2001, reflect data changes based on changes to the indicator in Year 7.


Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 2002

2A - Percentage of **full-time** faculty with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area. For Fall 2002, a standard of 70 - 84% earned a score of "Achieves" for 2A. In Year 7, this indicator did not include Instructors for the Research and Teaching sectors. The figures for Fall, 2001, were revised to reflect data changes based on changes to the indicator in Year 7.



**Two-Year Institutions-
Branches of USC, Fall
2002**



2A - Percentage of **full-time** faculty, including Instructors, with terminal degrees in the primary teaching area. For Fall 2002, a standard of 60-74% earned a score of "Achieves."



Technical College System, Fall 2002

Figure 2.2 – Indicator 2A- Percentage teaching in the Fall who meet minimum SACS degree criteria for credentials.

In Fall 2002, a standard of 98-99.9%, or all but one meeting criteria, earned a score of "Achieves."



Compensation of Faculty

Indicator 2D – Compensation of Faculty as a measure of average faculty salaries. For research and teaching sector institutions, the average by rank for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor is measured. Beginning in Year 6, the rank of instructor is excluded. A score is earned for each rank average. These individual scores are averaged to produce the indicator score earned. Standards of achievement are listed in the figures below detailing the average by rank for research and teaching institutions. For the Two-Year Campuses of USC and for the Technical Colleges, the average faculty salary data are displayed.

During the transition period from 2-year status to 4-year status, USC Beaufort is scored on a related indicator measuring the increase in the average salary of full-time instructors, excluding Instructors.

As was the case last year, 2D measures the average faculty salary for each two-year institution. The regional campuses of USC are assessed based on the overall average salary due to the low numbers of faculty at the various ranks. In the State Technical and Comprehensive Education System, faculty rank does not apply, so technical colleges are assessed on average faculty salary.

Full-time faculty includes those whose annual salary is not zero, who have an employment status of full-time and a primary responsibility of instruction (greater than 50% of assigned time). For medicine and dentistry, salaries less than or equal to \$40,000 are excluded.


For technical colleges, unclassified continuing education program coordinators are included.

Average salary is defined as nine to ten month salaries or eleven to twelve month salaries converted to nine month salaries. Salaries for basic and clinical medicine are not converted.

For Year 7, Fall 2002 data were considered.

Figure 2.3 Indicator 2D – Compensation of Faculty
Source: IPEDS Salaries Survey (9-month contract basis)


Assistant Professors, Research Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002




For Year 7 ratings, "Achieves" ranges were: \$42,773 - \$50,740 for Clemson, \$44,718 - \$53,047 for USC Columbia, and \$54,028 –\$ 64,091 for MUSC.

Assistant Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002

For Year 7 ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$36,840 - \$43,701 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities.




Associate Professors, Research Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002




For Year 7 ratings, "Achieves" ranges were: \$50,643- \$60,075 for Clemson, \$52,038 - \$61,730 for USC Columbia, and \$62,855 - \$74,562 for MUSC.

Associate Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002

For Year 7 ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$44,787 - \$53,129 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities




Professors, Research Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002



For Year 7 ratings, "Achieves" ranges were \$69,558 - \$82,514 for Clemson, \$71,798 - \$85,171 for USC Columbia, and \$79,965 - \$94,858 for MUSC.


Professors, Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002

For Year 7 ratings, the "Achieves" range was \$56,164 - \$66,624 for Four-Year Colleges and Universities




Transition Data for USC Beaufort

The chart below is based on average full-time faculty salaries, excluding Instructors. The range for "Achieves" in Year 7 is an increase of between \$1,501 and \$3,000.



Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002

The data below represent the average full-time faculty salary over the last three years.





For Year 7 ratings, an "Achieves" range of \$35,687- \$45,156 applied.

State Technical and Comprehensive Education System, Fall 2000 - Fall 2002

The data below represent the average of all full-time faculty over the last three years. The technical colleges do not have faculty rank.


For Year 7 ratings, an "Achieves" range of \$34,188 - \$43,260 applied.



(blank page)

Section 3

Classroom Quality



(blank page)

CLASSROOM QUALITY

This section presents a group of tables and performance funding indicators designed to give a picture of the overall quality of the classroom experience in South Carolina’s institutions of higher education.

Table 3.1, required by Act 255, as amended, indicates the number and percentage of course sections taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty and graduate assistants.

Data on **national accreditation of specific academic degree programs** are provided in Table 3.2, which summarizes the number of programs at each institution that are eligible for accreditation based on a CHE-approved list of agencies and programs and the number of those that are accredited. Some accrediting bodies (e.g., education and public health) accredit schools or units within the institutions, while others (e.g., business and engineering) accredit individual programs within the school or unit. The numbers seen in Table 3.2 reflect the number of accrediting agencies that acknowledge one or more programs at the institutions. The process of accreditation involves an external review based on national standards typically pertaining to the curriculum, faculty, students, resources and overall administration of the program; therefore, attainment of such accreditation is often considered an indication of overall program quality. However, some institutional administrators intentionally choose not to pursue accreditation for an accreditable program because the cost to do so may be considered too high. In performance funding, institutions are measured on the percentage of accredited programs, with the standard for an “Achieves” being 90 – 99%, or all but one program accredited. Measurement details for each institution are displayed in Section 11. Institutional performance on this indicator for Performance Year 7, 2002-2003, is shown in Figure 3.1

Each Teaching Sector institution is expected to attain accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Performance funding indicator **3E-Institutional Emphasis on Quality Teacher Education and Reform** encompasses this accreditation measure within subpart **3E1-Program Quality, NCATE Accreditation**. To earn credit, attainment of initial accreditation and maintaining such accreditation once achieved are expected. As of June 30, 2000, all public teacher education programs in South Carolina were accredited by NCATE, and remain so. Beginning in Year 6, the Research Sector is no longer included in Indicator 3E. However, their education programs also meet NCATE standards and are accredited. This accreditation is also included as part of indicator **3D-Accreditation of Programs**.

Also as part of **Indicator 3E-Institutional Emphasis on Quality of Teacher Education and Reform**, Teaching Sector institutions are measured on the success of their graduates on teacher certification exams (3E2a) and on producing teaching graduates who can fill critical shortages - both for specific subject areas (3E3a) and for minority teachers (3E3b). These data are displayed in Figures 3.2 – 3.4.

Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants

Provided here are data across all four sectors on the type of instructional personnel used to teach Lower Division sections during Fall 2002. **Full-time Faculty** are those personnel at the institution who were identified as full-time at the institution, had primary responsibility (over 50%) for instruction, and had a reported salary on CHEMIS. This definition captures faculty that were included under the Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefit report. For the technical colleges, unclassified continuing education program coordinators are counted as faculty. **Lower Division** here represents those courses that were coded in the CHEMIS course file as Remedial or Lower Division, including courses offered for credit toward the first and second year of an associates degree program and technical/vocational degrees offered below the baccalaureate level.

TABLE 3.1 LOCATED ON THE NEXT PAGE

**TABLE 3.1 - Courses Taught by Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty and by Graduate Assistants
LOWER DIVISION SECTIONS TAUGHT BY**

Institutions	TOTAL LOWER DIVISION SECTIONS	Faculty				Graduate Assistants	
		Full Time		Part Time		#	%
		#	%	#	%		
Research Universities							
Clemson	1595	1103	69.2%	283	17.7%	209	13.1%
USC Columbia	1775	951	53.6%	560	31.5%	264	14.9%
2002 Research Subtotal	3370	2054	60.9%	843	25.0%	473	14.0%
Four-Year Colleges and Universities							
The Citadel	398	260	65.3%	138	34.7%	0	0.0%
Coastal Carolina	690	479	69.4%	211	30.6%	0	0.0%
College of Charleston	1491	875	58.7%	616	41.3%	0	0.0%
Francis Marion	500	407	81.4%	93	18.6%	0	0.0%
Lander	430	323	75.1%	107	24.9%	0	0.0%
SC State	568	461	81.2%	107	18.8%	0	0.0%
USC Aiken	407	269	66.1%	138	33.9%	0	0.0%
USC Beaufort	170	99	58.2%	71	41.8%	0	0.0%
USC Spartanburg	319	304	31.0%	220	69.0%	0	0.0%
Winthrop	741	448	60.5%	293	39.5%	0	0.0%
2002 Four-Year Subtotals	5714	3925	68.7%	1994	34.9%	0	0.0%
Two-Year Branches of USC							
USC Lancaster	174	123	70.7%	51	29.3%	0	0.0%
USC Salkehatchie	113	68	60.2%	45	39.8%	0	0.0%
USC Sumter	168	131	78.0%	37	22.0%	0	0.0%
USC Union	53	27	50.9%	26	49.1%	0	0.0%
2002 Two-Year Subtotals	508	349	68.7%	159	31.3%	0	0.0%
Technical Colleges							
Aiken	493	277	56.2%	216	43.8%	0	0.0%
Central Carolina	490	352	71.8%	138	28.2%	0	0.0%
Denmark	235	175	74.5%	60	25.5%	0	0.0%
Florence-Darlington	816	498	61.0%	318	39.0%	0	0.0%
Greenville	1790	1088	60.8%	702	39.2%	0	0.0%
Horry-Georgetown	810	534	65.9%	276	34.1%	0	0.0%
Midlands	1683	940	55.9%	743	44.1%	0	0.0%
Northeastern	250	163	65.2%	87	34.8%	0	0.0%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	456	381	83.6%	75	16.4%	0	0.0%
Piedmont	1169	643	55.0%	526	45.0%	0	0.0%
Spartanburg	685	434	63.4%	251	36.6%	0	0.0%
TCL	339	246	72.6%	93	27.4%	0	0.0%
Tri-County	772	377	48.8%	395	51.2%	0	0.0%
Trident	1835	1107	60.3%	728	39.7%	0	0.0%
Williamsburg	172	78	45.3%	94	54.7%	0	0.0%
York	738	450	61.0%	288	39.0%	0	0.0%
2002 Technical College Subtotals	12733	7743	60.8%	4990	39.2%	0	0.0%

Indicator 3D – Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs

This indicator is used in assessing program accreditation in the performance funding system. Details regarding accreditation as applicable to performance funding are found in Section 11. Since April, 2002, institutions are assessed in performance funding on percentage of accredited programs. It should be noted that CHE policy provides an institution five years to attain full accreditation after a new program is added at an institution and provides the same length of time to gain accreditation of an existing program when an agency is added to the list of accrediting bodies recognized by CHE. For additional information, see our website at <http://www.che.sc.gov> and go to "Academic Affairs and Licensing."

For USC Beaufort, this is a compliance indicator during the transition from two to four-year status. Compliance is based on satisfactory progress toward SACS accreditation as a four-year institution. In Year 7, USC Beaufort was not in compliance for this indicator.


The following charts show accreditation percentages that were used in Year 7 performance funding ratings.

Figure 3.1 Indicator 3D - Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs


Source: Institutional reports

The “Achieves” range in effect for **all** institutions was 90% to 99%, or all but one program, for ratings in Spring 2003.

Research Institutions





Teaching Institutions



In Year 7, the Citadel, College of Charleston, Francis Marion, and USC Spartanburg had all but one program accredited.

Two-Year Branch Campuses of USC – The only branch campus having programs eligible for accreditation is USC Lancaster. Both of its programs are accredited.

Technical Colleges



In Year 7, Denmark Technical College and Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College had all but one program accredited.

Year 8 Accreditation Data and Table

In addition to reporting the performance levels on accreditation for the most recent scored performance year, the law requires that institutions report their current program accreditation status. The following table (Table 3.2) gives accreditation information submitted by the institutions on August 1, 2003. This information will be updated in the Spring of 2004 and used for the Year 8 indicator 3D score. The reader may note that, due to the use of updated data for performance funding calculations, numbers on institutional ratings reports may differ from those displayed in this table.

The numbers presented in Table 3.2 reflect a count of the number of agencies for which the institution has one or more programs accredited.

Table 3.2 Accreditation of Degree-Granting Programs. Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE

	As of June 30, 2003		
	Areas Eligible for Accreditation	Areas with one or More Programs Accredited	% Accredited
Research Universities			
Clemson	13	13	100%
USC Columbia	27	27	100%
MUSC	15	15	100%
Teaching Universities			
The Citadel	4	3	75%
Coastal Carolina Univ.	5	3	60%
College of Charleston	8	7	88%
Francis Marion Univ.	5	4	80%
Lander University	7	5	71%
SC State Univ.	14	10	71%
USC Aiken	4	4	100%
USC Beaufort*			
USC Spartanburg	5	5	100%
Winthrop University	13	13	100%
Two-Year Branches of USC			
USC Lancaster	2	2	100%
USC Salkehatchie			
USC Sumter			
USC Union			
Technical Colleges			
Aiken Tech	4	3	75%
Central Carolina Tech	6	6	100%
Denmark Tech	3	2	67%
Florence-Darlington	11	11	100%
Greenville Tech	16	16	100%
Horry-Georgetown Tech	9	9	100%
Midlands Tech	14	14	100%
Northeastern Tech	2	0	0%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	8	7	88%
Piedmont Tech	10	10	100%
Spartanburg Tech	9	9	100%
Tech Coll. of LowCountry	4	4	100%
Tri-County Tech	9	9	100%
Trident Tech	15	15	100%
Williamsburg Tech	1	1	100%
York Tech	8	8	100%
Total	249	232	93%

* USC Beaufort is currently seeking SACS accreditation as a four-year institution.

Student Performance on Teacher Education Examinations

Performance Funding Indicator 3E, Subpart 3E2a measures the percentage of students who pass the PRAXIS II Professional Learning and Teaching (PLT) exam. As of 2000-01, graduating teacher education students are not required to take this exam immediately upon graduation, but are given a three-year window to take and pass the exam. Differing institutional policies on test-taking by new graduates led to test-taking rates that vary widely, causing a situation in which charting the institutional passing rates would lead to meaningless comparisons. This indicator has been deferred for the past three years. Data on prior years are reported in the 2001 edition of *A Closer Look*.

Performance Funding Indicator 3E, Subpart 3E2b measures the percentage of students who pass the PRAXIS II Specialty Area Exams. These exams are required of all graduates. In Year 6, this indicator was identified as the mission focused measure for teaching sector institutions. Clemson and USC Columbia continue to report the data as part of Indicator 7D.


Four-Year Colleges and Universities, 1999 - 2002

The chart below represents the percent teacher education students at each institution who passed Specialty Area Examinations during the year indicated. Since 1999-2000 these have been based on the PRAXIS II exam. In previous years they were primarily based on the National Teachers Examination. The annual reporting timeframe is April 1 – March 31. It should be noted that the pass rates for the Praxis II exam are based on all student takers rather than first time takers as on other certification exams reported in Section 7 of this document.

Although Clemson and USC Columbia are not included in this indicator, their education graduates take the same exams. For 2001-02, Clemson’s students had a pass rate of 74.2% and USC Columbia had a pass rate of 97.1%.

Figure 3.2 Percentage of students in teacher education programs who pass the PRAXIS II Specialty Area Exams. Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE

The “Achieves” range for this indicator was 75% - 89% for Performance Year 7 (2002-2003)




Performance Funding Indicator 3E (Subparts 3a and 3b), Teacher Education Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas, assesses two critical needs areas for teachers: 1) the number of graduates in state critical shortage areas; and 2) minority graduates from teacher preparation programs. These measures apply only to Teaching Sector institutions.

Critical shortage areas are those determined by the South Carolina Department of Education based on state need and for purposes of loan repayments. Data for the percent of graduates in critical shortage areas for the past three years are shown below in Figure 3.6. The critical shortage areas have changed over the years as teacher shortages have increased. For performance funding, those areas identified in 2000 have been used. These are: Art, Business Education, English/Language Arts, Family and Consumer Science (Home Economics), Foreign Languages (French, German, Latin, and Spanish), Industrial Technology, Library Science, Mathematics, Science (all areas), Music (Choral), and Special Education (all areas including speech pathology, occupational, and physical therapy).

Figure 3.3 – Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Graduates in Critical Shortage Areas, 1999-2000 through 2001-02

Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE

The percentage of graduates in critical shortage areas for each institution is shown for each of the academic years represented. The “Achieves” range in effect for Academic Year 2001-02 data rated in Spring 2003 was 20% - 34%.




Teacher Education Graduates who are Minority

Minority Teacher Education Graduates for the years shown include African-American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students who graduated from public institutions in teacher education.

Figure 3.4 – Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Percent of Graduates who are Minority, 1998-99 through 2000-01

Source: Institutional Reports to CHE



The percentage of graduates from teacher education programs who are minority is represented below. The “Achieves” range in effect for Academic Year 2001-02 data rated in Spring 2003 was 10% - 20%.

Assessment Information for the Institution’s Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 Report

In 2001, the South Carolina Legislature amended Section 59-101-350 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, to include the following as an institutional effectiveness reporting requirement.

- Assessment information for the institution’s Title II of the Federal Higher Education Act of 1998 report that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications and the performance of the candidates and graduates;

A link to South Carolina Title II summary information, maintained by the SC Department of Education (SDE), is <http://www.title2.org/scripts/statereports/rptHome.asp>. Tabular data showing institutions’ performance on various requirements of Title II reporting will be posted by the SDE, but are not yet available. These tables will include information on all South Carolina teaching institutions, to include private institutions. Links to the Title II reports of the individual institutions can be found below.

2003 Title II Reports on Institutional Websites

- Citadel <http://www.citadel.edu/planningandassessment/title2/contents.htm>
- Clemson <http://www.clemson.edu/reports>
- College of Charleston <http://irp.cofc.edu/titleii/>
- Coastal Carolina <http://www.coastal.edu/education/title2/index.html>
- Francis Marion <http://www.fmarion.edu/sebss/hea.htm>
- Lander <http://www.lander.edu/education/Title%20II.htm>
- SC State <http://www.scsu.edu/testsite/ir/titleii.htm>
- USC Columbia [http://www.ed.sc.edu/news_pdf_files/2003 Title II Institutional Report.pdf](http://www.ed.sc.edu/news_pdf_files/2003%20Title%20II%20Institutional%20Report.pdf)
- USC Aiken <http://www.usca.edu/education//title2.html>
- USC Spartanburg http://www.uscs.edu/academics/se/current_t_report.html
- Winthrop <http://coe.winthrop.edu/title2/>

Graduates' Achievements - Alumni Surveys

All public colleges and universities in the state are required to administer an Alumni Survey and report the results every two years. The data are gathered from alumni who graduated three years prior to the current reporting year (i.e., alumni graduating in 1999-2000). Institutions are listed by sector and the return rate from the survey is provided. The survey contains four common questions with several subparts to three of the questions. All institutions are required to use these common questions and each subpart.

The questions highlighted in the tables are subparts, pulled from Question One on the survey: "Students' level of satisfaction with:". The number of responses is presented in addition to the percent of those who answered in one of the six choices.

Table 3.3 - Graduates' Satisfaction – Alumni Survey
Source: Institutional Reports to CHE

Question: Students' level of Satisfaction with:

Institution	Year 1999-2000	Major Program of Study							
		Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied	
Research Universities									
Clemso		141	58.2	35.5	0	6.4	0	0	
USC Columbia		295	39.0	48.8	8.1	3.1	0.7	0.3	
MUSC		197	46.5	47.9	5.6	0	0/0	0	
Four-Year Colleges & Universities									
Citadel		110	51.4	39.4	7.3	0.9	0	0.9	
Coastal Carolina		70	44.3	47.1	5.7	1.4	0	1.4	
Coll. O		340	50.9	41.2	6.2	0.9	0.6	0.03	
Francis Marion		No results due to extremely low response to Web Survey							
Lande		56	57.1	28.6	10.7	0	3.6	0	
SC State		131	35.9	58	4.6	0	0.8	0.8	
USC Aiken		118	55.9	34.7	8.5	0.8	0	0	
USC Beaufort		11	45.5	54.5	0	0	0	0	
USC Spartanburg		198	44.4	44.4	8.6	1.5	0.5	0.5	
Winthrop									
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC									
USC Lancaster		19	36.8	52.6	5.3	0	5.3	0	
USC Salkehatchie									
USC Sumter		30	56.7	40	3.3	0		0	
USC Union		14	64.3	21.4	7.1	0	7.1	0	

Section 3 – Classroom Quality

Question: Students' level of Satisfaction with:

Institution	Year 1999-2000	Major Program of Study						
		Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
State Technical College System								
Aiken		42	47.6	40.5	7.1	0	0	4.8
Central Carolina		49	55.1	44.9	0	0	0	0
Northe		19	52.6	42.1	5.3	0	0	0
Denmark		29	31	62	7	0	0	0
Floren -Darlington		65	64.6	8.2	21.5	3.1	0	1.5
Greenville		250	42.8	45.2	9.2	1.6	0.4	0.8
Horry-								
Midlands		158	46	39	8	2	2	3
Orang alhoun		54	53.7	38.9	7.4	0	0	0
Piedmont		79	46.8	44.3	6.3	0	1.3	1.3
Spartanburg		48	47.9	45.8	4.2	2.1	0	0
Tech. Coll of the Lwcntry		33	30.3	42.4	27.3	0	0	0
Tri-County		91	44	49.5		0	1.1	0
Trident		64	53.1	7.8	10.9	1.6	0	4.7
Williamsburg								
York		40	55	32.5	10	0	2.5	0

Institution	Year 1999-2000	Instruction in the Major						
		Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Research Universities								
Clemson		142	64.1	33.8	0	1.4	0	0.7
USC Columbia		295	34.2	46.1	14.6	2.7	0.7	0.3
MUSC		71		40.8	14.1	4.2	0	0
Four-Year Colleges and Universities								
Citadel			43.6	40.9	10.9	4.5		0
Coastal Carolina		70	35.7	58.6	4.3	0	0	1.4
Coll. Of Charleston		340	47.1	46.8	5	0.6	0.6	0
Francis Marion			No results due to extremely low response to Web Survey					
Lander			57.1	28.6	10.7	0	3.6	0
SC State		124	29	48.4	17.7	4	0.8	0
USC Aiken			49.2	38.1	11	1.7	0	0
USC Spartanburg			43.4	40.9	13.1	2	0.5	0
Winthrop								

Section 3 – Classroom Quality

Institution	Instruction in the Major						
	Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC							
USC Beaufort		36.4	45.5	18.2	0	0	0
USC Lancaster	19	52.6	36.8	5.3	0	5.3	0
USC Salkehatchie**							
USC Sumter	30	10	6.7	0	0	0	0
USC Union		57.1	14.3	0	0	28.6	0
State Technical College System							
Aiken		47.6	40.5	7.1	0	2.4	2.4
Central Carolina	49	49	42.9	6.1	1	0	0
Northeastern		36.8	52.6	10.5	0	0	0
Denmark	29	24	69	7	0	0	0
Florence-Darlington		61.5	9.2	24.6	3.1	1.5	0
Greenville	250	42.8	45.2	9.2	1.6	0.4	0.8
Horry-Georgetown							
Midlands	156	43	41	11	2	1	2
Orangeburg-Calhoun		47.2	47.2	5.7	0	0	0
Piedmont	70	51.4	41.4	4.3	2.9	0	0
Spartanburg	45	51.1	44.4	4.4	0	0	0
Tech. Coll of the Lwcntry	34	23.5	50	20.6	2.9	0	0
Tri-County	91	42.9	49.5	6.6	0	1.1	0
Trident	63	49.2	31.7	9.5	3.2	3.2	3.2
Williamsburg							
York	40	55	37.5	5	2.5	0	0

Institution	1999-2000	General Education Program of Study						
		Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Research Universities								
Clemson		1	42.1	51.4	0	5	0	1.4
USC Columbia		293	16	55.3	22.2	5.8	0	0.7
MUSC								
Four-Year Colleges and Universities								
Citadel		104	27.9	51.9	1	4.8	1	1
Coastal Carolina		70	15.7	54.3	25.7	2.9	0	1.4
Coll. Of Charleston		339	32.4	52.8	12.1	1	0.9	0
Francis Marion		No results due to extremely low response to Web Survey						
Lander		5	26.8	60.7	10.7	1.8	0	0

Section 3 – Classroom Quality

Institution	Number of Responses to Question	General Classroom Quality					
		% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
SC State	132	6.1	73.5	15.9	3	0.8	0.8
USC Aiken	115	30.4	53.9	1	2.6	0	0
USC Spartanburg	1	27.8	53.1	17	1	0.5	0
Winthrop							
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC							
USC Beaufort	1	36.4	45.5	18.2	0	0	0
USC Lancaster	19	42.1	52.6	5.3	0	0	0
USC Salkehatchie	26	53.8	38.5	7.7	0	0	0
USC Sumter	31	41.9	48.4	9.7	0	0	0
USC Union	14	71.4	7.1	7.1	0	7	7
State Technical College System							
Aiken	42	35.7	52.4	1	0	0	0
Central Carolina	47	42.6	51.1	6.4	0	0	0
Northeastern	19	6	2	1	0	0	0
Denmark	29	21	72	7	0	0	0
Florence-Darlington	65	60	13.8	20	4.6	1	0
Greenville	244	25	57	14.8	2	0.4	0.8
Horry-Georgetown							
Midlands	149	33	49	12	3	1	3
Orangeburg-Calhoun	55	23.6	58.2	1	0	0	0
Piedmont	70	34.3	57.1	7.1	1.4	0	0
Spartanburg	49	4	46.9	8	2	0	0
Tech. Coll of the Lwcntry	34	14.7	52.9	32.4	0	0	0
Tri-County	91	23.1	62.6	14.3	0	0	0
Trident	63	30.2	42.9	20.6	3.2	1.6	1.6
Williamsburg							
York	40	40	47.5	7.5	5	0	0

Institution	Number of Responses to Question	Instruction in General Education					
		% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Research Universities 1999-2000							
Clemson	140	41.4	52.9		4.3		1.4
USC Columbia	293	15.7	52.9	24.9	5.1	0.7	0.7
MUSC							
Four-Year Colleges and Universities							

Section 3 – Classroom Quality

Institution	Instruction in General Education						
	Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Citadel	105	28.6	52.4	16.2	2.9	0	0
Coastal Carolina	70	15.7	62.9	18.6	1.4	0	1.4
Coll. Of Charleston	340	28.8	52.1	15.9	2.9	0.3	
Francis Marion	No results due to extremely low response to Web Survey						
Lander	56	30.4	57.1	12.5		0	0
SC State	127	7.9	78.7	11.8	1.6	0	0
USC Aiken	116	33.6	53.4	12.1	0.9	0	0
USC Spartanburg	194	30.4	51.5	17.5	0.5	0	0
Winthrop							
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC							
USC Beaufort	11	54.5	36.4	18.2		0	0
USC Lancaster	19	42.1	47.4	10.5	0	0	0
USC Salkehatchie	26	50	42.3	7.7	0	0	0
USC Sumter	31	41.9	51.6	6.5	0	0	0
USC Union	14	64.3	21.4	0	0	7	7
State Technical College System							
Aiken Tech	42	31	59.5	9.5	0	0	0
Central Carolina	48	47.9	45.8	6.3	0	0	0
Northeastern	19	42.1	47.4	1	0	0	0
Denmark	29	38	48	14	0	0	0
Florence-Darlington	65	56.9	13.8	24.8	4.6	0	0
Greenville	247	27.1	53.8	14.2	4	0	0.8
Horry-Georgetown							
Midlands	154	31	50	14	2	0	3
Orangeburg-Calhoun	54	27.8	50	18.5	1.9	0	0
Piedmont	67	32.8	56.7	9	1.5	0	0
Spartanburg	47	42.6	48.9	8.5	0	0	0
Tech. Coll of the Lwcntry	35	28.6	42.9	25.7	2.9	0	0
Tri-County	91	23.1	61.5	15.4	0	0	0
Trident	63	36.5	47.6	11.1	0	1.6	3.2
Williamsburg							
York	38	50	47.4	2.6	0	0	0


Section 3 – Classroom Quality

Institution		Overall Academic Experience						
		Number of Responses to Question	% Very Satisfied	% Satisfied	% Somewhat Satisfied	% Somewhat Dissatisfied	% Dissatisfied	% Very Dissatisfied
Research Universities	1999-2000							
Clemson		142	67.6	31	0	2	0	0
USC Columbia		295	31.9	55.6	10.2	1	0.3	1
MUSC		71	36.6	49.3	12.7	1.4	0	0
Four-Year Colleges and Universities								
Citadel		109	46.8	41.3		0	9	0
Coastal Carolina		70	35.7	52.9	7.1	1.4	1.4	1.4
Coll. Of Charleston		340	48.2	44.4	4.7	1.8	0.9	
Francis Marion		No results due to extremely low response to Web Survey						
Lander		56	48.2	41.1	8.9	1.8		0
SC State		133	23.3	60.9	10.5	1.5	0.8	3
USC Aiken		118	48.3	44.9	6.8	0	0	0
USC Spartanburg		198	42.2	44.9	10.6	1.5	0.5	0
Winthrop								
Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC								
USC Beaufort		11	81.8	18.2	0	0	0	0
USC Lancaster		19	52.6	42.1	5.3	0	0	0
USC Salkehatchie		26	53.8	38.5	7.7	0	0	0
USC Sumter		31	58.1	35.5	6.5	0	0	0
USC Union		14	64.3	21.4	7.1	0	7.1	0
State Technical College System								
Aiken		42	50	42.9	2.4	0	2.4	2.4
Central Carolina		49	61.2	32.7	6.1	0	0	0
Northeastern		19	52.6	36.8	10.5		0	0
Denmark		29	24	55	14	7	0	0
Florence-Darlington		100	54.6	9.2	24.5	1.5	0	0
Greenville		249	37.8	49	10.8	8	4	1.2
Horry-Georgetown								
Midlands		159	38	50	8	2	1	2
Orangeburg-Calhoun		56	48.2	42.9	8.9	0	0	0
Piedmont		70	51.4	44.3	2.9	1.4	0	0
Spartanburg		50	50	44	6	0	0	0
Tech. Coll of the Lwcntry		35	34.4	40	20	2.9	2.9	0
Tri-County		90	33.3	63.3	2.2	0	1.1	0
Trident		64	43.8	39.1	7.8	3.1	1.6	4.7
Williamsburg								
York		40	42.5	52.5	5	0	0	0

(blank page)

Section 4

Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration



(blank page)

Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

Indicators 4A – **Sharing and use of Technology, Programs, Equipment, Supplies and Source Matter within the Institution, with Other Institutions and with the Business Community** and 4B – **Cooperation and Collaboration with Private Industry**, were scored as compliance indicators based on institutional reporting of activities in Performance Year 3. Given the nature of these indicators and the high level of compliance, they were put on a three-year scoring cycle, and were not scored in Years 4 and 5. During Year 5, the Commission approved continuing, for Year 6 and beyond, a revised measure of institutional cooperation and collaboration as a scored indicator tailored to each sector.

As described in the following excerpt from the “Performance Funding Workbook for Year 7,(p II, 83)”

Effective Year 7, measures and standards for each of the sectors were approved on September 5, 2002 (Research, Regional Campuses, and Technical Colleges) and on November 7, 2002 (Teaching). The research sector measure focuses on enhancing collaborative research within the sector and is intended to be followed for 5 years (Years 6-10). The teaching sector measure focuses on program advisory boards and program internships/co-ops to improve the cooperation and collaboration between the sector and the profit and non-profit sectors and is intended to be followed over 4 years (Years 7-10). The regional campuses sector measure focuses on strengthening the campuses community outreach efforts with the private and public sectors and is intended as a 4 year measure (Years 6-9). The technical colleges measure focuses on strengthening technical college program advisory committees through enhanced involvement of business, industry and community representatives and is intended as a 3 year measure (Years 7-9)


For details on Sector measures, it is important that the reader refer to the Performance Funding Workbook for Year 7, [http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Perform/Workbook_4th_Edition\(Year_7\)/word_versions.htm](http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Perform/Workbook_4th_Edition(Year_7)/word_versions.htm) (pages II 85 - II 118), to find information on the components and scoring of this indicator.

Charts showing individual institution data on this indicator follow.

Research - To enhance collaborative research within the Research Sector including the development and use of an integrated faculty and grants database system. This indicator measures the change in the number of collaborative research projects compared to the average of the previous three years. The range for “Achieves” in Year 7 was 39-43 collaborative projects. The Research Institutions have increased the number of collaborative projects from 29 in 1999-2000 to 46 in 2002-2003.



Teaching – Cooperation and Collaboration with Business and Industry and PreK-12 Education, Health and Welfare as assessed by using a four-part measure in which compliance on each part will be determined and institutions scored relative to the number of the parts for which they are in compliance. The measure focuses on membership on program advisory boards as a means to assess and improve the cooperation and collaboration between the teaching institutions and the profit and non-profit sectors. In Performance Year 7 (2002-2003), all teaching institutions scored the maximum possible (all four parts in compliance with requirements) on this indicator.

Figure 4.1 Institutional Collaboration and Cooperation




Regional Campuses of USC This indicator assesses the strength of the community outreach efforts of the USC Regional Campuses by determining the percentage of best practice criteria that are utilized. The range for “Achieves” in Year 7 was 85% to 95%.

Technical Colleges – For the Technical Sector, this indicator focuses on strengthening technical college program advisory committees through enhanced involvement of business, industrial, and community representatives. Each Technical College is assessed as to the strength of its advisory committees by determining the percentage of best practices criteria that are met by an institution’s advisory committees. The range for “Achieves” in Year 7 was 80% to 95% of criteria met.



Section 5

Administrative Efficiency



(blank page)

ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY

This performance indicator (5A) was deferred due to changes in federal reporting requirements for financial data. These changes affect all public higher education institutions, making comparisons to past data invalid. The changes are of such a nature as to render “administrative efficiency” as defined in the past impossible to evaluate. The indicator is under revision for future years. For definitions and standards used in past years, see pp. 133-135 of the September 2000 Performance Funding workbook.

Past performance on indicator 5A as previously defined can be found in the publication *A Closer Look at Public Higher Education in South Carolina – January 2003*.

(Blank Page)

Section 6 Entrance Requirements



(blank page)

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) collects data on institutions' entrance requirements, preparation of entering freshmen, and developmental course offerings. Portions of these data are used in performance funding evaluations for Critical Success Factor 6.

Effective in Year 6 (2001-02), Indicator 6A - SAT and ACT Scores of Entering Freshmen, and 6B – High School Standing, Grade Point Averages (GPA) were combined in a single indicator measuring entrance credentials of first-time entering freshmen. This indicator applies to the Research Sector (except MUSC), the Teaching Sector, and Two-Year Branches of USC. A comparable measure has been implemented for MUSC. See Figure 6.1 for additional details and data.

Data on SAT and ACT scores and high school rank and GPA's (Figure 6.1) indicate a general increase in admission standards for research universities and four-year colleges and universities and a mixed outcome for two-year branches of USC.

Table 6.1 outlines the success of students in developmental courses. The research universities, however, do not offer these courses and the four-year colleges and universities have reduced or eliminated developmental courses entirely.

Act 255 of 1992, as amended, requires information to be reported on the “percent of graduate students who received undergraduate degrees at the institutions, within the State, within the United States, and from other nations.” This information can be found in Table 6.2, with two years of data shown.

Admission standards for South Carolina's public in-state institutions are addressed more thoroughly in Table 6.2 and Figures 6.3 and 6.4. The data excerpted here are from a report on admissions standards that is prepared annually by CHE's Division of Academic Affairs and can be accessed at www.che.sc.gov. A summary of the report is provided in the illustrations named above.


Qualifications of Entering Freshmen

Performance Indicator 6A/B– SAT Scores of the Student Body/High School Standing, Grade Point Average, and Activities of the Student Body measures the percentage of first-time freshmen who meet or exceed Commission-approved target scores on the SAT or ACT, high school grade point average, or high school class standing. The composite SAT and ACT scores for all first-time entering freshmen test takers including provisional students are considered. The data shown below are representative of SAT scores of 1000 and higher and ACT scores of 21 and higher, a GPA of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale, or class standing in the top 30%.

A comparable version of this measure was approved for MUSC beginning in Year 6. For MUSC, first-time entering graduate and first professional entering credentials are assessed. Scores on the Medical College Admissions Test (MCAT-26.6), Dental Admission Test (DAT-34), Pharmacy College Admission Test (PCAT-200), Graduate Record Exam (GRE-1587 for all three parts), Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT-521), college GPA (at least 3.0 on a 4 point scale), and class standing (top 30%) are considered. The range for “Achieves” is 70% to 85%, and MUSC had 93.5% of its entering first-time graduate students and first professionals meeting the criteria in Year 7.

This measure is not applicable to the Technical College Sector. Additional details on the measure can be found in the performance funding workbook.

Figure 6.1 – SAT/ACT Scores and High School Rank and GPA of Student Body
Source: CHEMIS Data




**Research Universities
 Fall 2000 – Fall 2002**

For Fall 2002 data, an “Achieves” range of 75% to 89.9% applied for Clemson and USC Columbia. Above this range is scored as “Exceeds.”

Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002


For Fall 2002 data, an “Achieves” range of 50% to 79.9% applied. Above this range is scored as “Exceeds.”



*USC Beaufort, as part of its transition plan, was scored on the same range as the Regional Sector.

**Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC
Fall 2000 – Fall 2002**

For Fall 2002 data, an “Achieves” range of 20% to 49.9% applied. Above this range is scored as “Exceeds.”



Success of Students in Developmental Courses

Students are usually enrolled in developmental courses because they have been determined by the institution to lack certain skills that are needed for college level work. None of the research universities provide such courses. A shrinking number of public institutions offer from one to three courses in such areas as written composition, reading, and mathematics. These courses are being phased out in the four-year colleges and universities. During the period for which the data in this table were collected, several senior institutions contracted with a nearby technical college to offer some developmental courses. Students who complete such courses at technical colleges are not included in this report.

Table 6.1 Success of Students in Developmental Courses
Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE and CHEMIS Data

Institution	YEAR (Fall Term)	ENROLLMENT - Full Time, First-Time Freshmen (CHEMIS Data)	INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS		COURSE REGISTRATION		
			# Taking at least one dev. course	% Taking at least one dev. course	# Exiting all dev. courses	# Completing appropriate entry-level courses	% Completing appropriate entry-level courses
Four-Year Colleges & Universities							
Citadel Coastal Carolina Lander USC Aiken USC Spartanburg Winthrop		These 6 institutions have had no remedial courses in this time- frame.					
College of Charleston	1999	2,074	48	2%	31	30	97%
	2000	2,001	39	2%	36	32	89%
	2001*	1,970	26	1%	26	25	96%
Francis Marion	1999	570	36	6%	34	24	71%
	2000	603	22	4%	18	11	61%
	2001	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SC State	1999	680	101	15%	97	93	96%
	2000	569	35	6%	35	35	100%
	2001	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* College of Charleston offered a non-credit course that was not used to in the Mission Resource Requirement formula.

Sources of First-Time Degrees for Graduate Students

The following table summarizes the data on the sources of undergraduate degrees for first-time, degree-seeking graduates at the state’s public institutions. Two years of data are shown in the table.

Table 6.2 Source: CHEMIS Data

Institution	Year	First-time, Degree-seeking Graduate Enrollment	Undergraduate Degrees Were Received From :																			
			Reporting Institution		Other SC Institutions		Other U.S. Institutions		Non-U.S. Institutions		Unknown											
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%										
Research Universities																						
Clemson	Fall 01	788	196	24.90%	131	16.60%	194	24.60%	186	23.60%	81	10.30%										
	Fall 02	798	216	27.10%	92	11.50%	246	30.80%	175	21.90%	69	8.60%										
USC Columbia	Fall 01	864	0	0.00%	139	16.10%	582	67.40%	143	16.60%	0	0.00%										
	Fall 02	909	0	0.00%	122	13.40%	689	75.80%	98	10.80%	0	0.00%										
MUSC	Fall 01	212	0	0.00%	30	14.20%	109	51.40%	0	0.00%	73	34.40%										
	Fall 02	231	0	0.00%	29	12.60%	194	84.00%	0	0.00%	8	3.46%										
Sector Totals	Fall 01	1864	196	10.50%	300	16.10%	885	47.50%	329	17.70%	154	8.30%										
	Fall 02	1938	216	11.15%	243	12.54%	1129	58.26%	273	14.09%	0	0.00%										
Four-Year Colleges & Universities																						
Citadel	Fall 01	263	23	8.80%	120	45.60%	83	31.60%	0	0.0%	37	14.10%										
	Fall 02	260	18	6.92%	112	43.08%	91	35.00%	1	0.38%	38	14.62%										
Coastal Carolina	Fall 01	9	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9	100%										
	Fall 02	46	24	52.17%	7	15.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	15	32.61%										
Coll. Of Charleston	Fall 01	159	61	38.40%	28	17.60%	67	42.10%	3	1.90%	0	0.00%										
	Fall 02	115	37	32.17%	34	29.57%	42	36.52%	2	1.74%	0	0.00%										
Francis Marion	Fall 01	38	18	47.40%	12	31.60%	8	21.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%										
	Fall 02	43	18	41.86%	14	32.56%	11	25.58%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%										
Lander	Fall 01	17	5	29.40%	9	52.90%	2	11.80%	1	5.90%	0	0.00%										
	Fall 02	13	3	23.08%	8	61.54%	2	15.38%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%										
SC State	Fall 01	116	14	12.10%	13	11.20%	2	1.70%	0	0.00%	87	75.00%										
	Fall 02	130	9	6.92%	4	3.08%	1	0.77%	0	0.00%	116	89.23%										
USC-Aiken	Fall 01	5	0	0.00%	1	20.00%	4	80.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%										
	Fall 02	12	0	0.00%	5	41.67%	6	50.00%	1	8.33%	0	0.00%										
USC-Spartanburg	Fall 01	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A										
	Fall 02	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A										
Winthrop	Fall 01	237	82	34.60%	56	23.60%	85	35.90%	11	4.60%	3	1.30%										
	Fall 02	257	77	29.96%	79	0.00%	85	33.07%	8	3.11%	8	3.11%										
Sector Totals	Fall 01	844	203	24.10%	239	28.30%	251	29.70%	15	1.80%	136	16.10%										
	Fall 02	876	186	21.23%	263	30.02%	238	27.17%	12	1.37%	177	20.21%										

Admission Standards

Annually, SC public institutions of higher education report to the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) on admission standards for first-time entering freshmen. The Division of Academic Affairs compiles a report, “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-Time Entering Freshmen,” based on information submitted from institutions. A copy of the full report can be found at <http://www.che400.state.sc.us> and then selecting the Division of Academic Affairs. Some of the data reported include high school course prerequisites for college admission taken by applicants, SAT/ACT scores of applicants, provisional admissions, and applications, acceptance and enrollment. Table 6.3 details the number and percent of students who applied for and were offered admission at each public senior institution. Over the three years shown, the number of applications to South Carolina's public senior institutions has shown a higher increase than the number of applicants offered admission. The overall percent offered admission shows a decline across the past three years.

Table 6.3 Applications and Admission Offers, SC Senior Public Institutions, Fall 1999 to Fall 2001
 Source: From CHE’s “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen”

	Fall 2002			Fall 2001			Fall 2000		
	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission	Applications Received	Number Offered Admission	Percent Offered Admission
Total for SC Senior Inst.				47,321	30,984	65.5%	45,160	29,922	66.3%
Research Institution Total	23,331	14,310	61.3%	22,493	13,652	60.7%	20,431	13,587	66.5%
Clemson	11,315	5,864	51.8%	11,315	5,864	51.8%	10,472	6,685	63.8%
USC Columbia	12,016	8,446	70.3%	11,178	7,788	69.7%	9,959	6,902	69.3%
Four-Yr Colleges and Universities Total	26,534	18,258	68.8%	24,828	17,332	69.8%	24,729	16,335	66.1%
Citadel	1,922	1,296	67.4%	1,922	1,296	67.4%	1,804	1,449	80.3%
Coastal	3,603	2,580	71.6%	3,094	2,296	74.2%	2,533	1,813	71.6%
Coll of Charleston	8,635	5,144	59.6%	8,358	5,471	65.5%	7,953	5,321	66.9%
Francis Marion	1,939	1,465	75.6%	1,657	1,281	77.3%	1,632	1,257	77.0%
Lander	1,603	1,295	80.8%	1,539	1,307	84.9%	1,441	1,165	80.8%
SC State	2,346	2,018	86.0%	2,295	1,837	80.0%	3,720	1,487	40.0%
USC Aiken	1,315	912	69.4%	1,237	708	57.2%	1,321	846	64.0%
USC Spartanburg	1,567	969	61.8%	1,519	747	49.2%	1,356	834	61.5%
Winthrop	3,604	2,579	71.6%	3,207	2,389	74.5%	2,969	2,163	72.9%

Figure 6.2 Percent of Applicants Offered Admission who Subsequently Accepted and Enrolled, Fall 2000 to Fall 2002

Source: CHE’s “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen”





Figure 6.3 shows a comparison of the average SAT or ACT combined scores of first-time entering freshmen for each institution for 2000, 2001, and 2002. In order to calculate the average, ACT scores are converted to SAT equivalents using the ACT/SAT Concordance tables. All entering freshmen including foreign, provisional and students over 22 years old are included. The data in Figure 6.3 are reviewed annually by the CHE as part of its annual report on admission standards of first-time entering freshmen.

Figure 6.3 Average SAT/ACT Combined Scores of ALL first-time entering freshmen for 4- and 2-year SC public institutions


Source: From CHE’s “Annual Report on Admission Standards for First-time Entering Freshmen”

Research Universities




*Excluding MUSC

Teaching Universities




Two-Year Regional Campuses of USC



*Due to data reporting factors, USC Beaufort is included in this group for the latest reporting year.

Section 7 Graduates’ Achievements



(blank page)

GRADUATES’ ACHIEVEMENTS

The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) evaluates graduates’ achievements based on graduation rates (Performance Indicator 7A), scores on licensure and professional examinations (Performance Indicators 3E2a, 3E2b, and 7D), and, for the regional campuses of USC, the regional campus sector focused measure, 7E, Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education. This measure, developed in Year 6, is a cohort based measure of the percentage of students who earn a baccalaureate degree within six years from a four-year degree granting institution. Additionally, the Commission has been working with the Technical Sector institutions to develop appropriate measures of employment rate and employer feedback (Performance Indicators 7B and 7C). Data for 7B and 7C are unavailable this year since the measures area still under development.

This past year, the graduation rate measure remained the same for the USC – Columbia, Clemson, teaching institutions, and regional campuses. A measure of graduation rates of graduate students was implemented for MUSC in Year 6 (2001-2002). This measure captures the percentage of first-time, full-time graduate students, except those in Ph. D. programs, and first professional students who complete graduate degree programs within a specified timeframe.


For applicability in upcoming years, the Commission worked with two-year institutions in defining an expanded graduation rate measure better focused on the mission of South Carolina’s regional campuses and technical colleges. The new measure is cohort-based assessing graduation within 150% of normal program time, transfer-out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The measure will use the same cohort of students as defined in graduation rate information presented on the following pages. During Year 6, baseline data were collected and measurement definitions were refined. The measures as implemented in Year 7 Data for Indicator 7A are presented by Sector in Figure 7.1.

For additional information on degrees awarded, undergraduate and graduate, in South Carolina, the reader is referred to the CHE’s publication “Higher Education Statistical Abstract for South Carolina.” A copy of the 2002 edition and several past years are available on-line by selecting “Publications” on the Commission’s home page.

Performance Funding Graduation Rate

For **Performance Funding Indicator 7A – Graduation Rates**, institutions are assessed based on the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen receiving degrees within 150% of normal time. Generally, 150% of normal program time is three years for a two-year degree and six years for a four-year degree. Shown below are data from IPEDS. The reader should note that Figure 7.1 shows graduation results for students in cohorts entering in Fall 1994, 1995, and 1996 for four-year institutions and cohorts entering in Fall 1997, 1998, and 1999 for two-year institutions. Data for the 1996 and 1999 cohorts are comparable to the percents displayed for graduation within six years or 150% of normal time for the four-year institutions and within 150% of program time for the two-year institutions. A comparable indicator applied to MUSC, for which it had a 94.7% graduation rate as defined for its graduate (excluding Ph. D.) and first professional students.

Figure 7.1 - Performance Funding Indicator 7A – Graduation Rates
Source: CHEMIS Data




**Research Universities
 1994, 1995, and 1996
 Cohorts**

The figure displayed at left represents the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen who received degrees within 150% of program time. The range for an “Achieves” for the 1996 cohort was 64% to 67% for Clemson and 53% to 61% for USC. These ranges were based on national peer data for each.


Four-Year Colleges and Universities – 1994, 1995, and 1996 Cohorts

The figure below displays the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen receiving degrees at each four-year college and university within 150% of program time. The “Achieves” range for the 1996 cohort for these institutions was 36% to 49%. This range was based on data available from comparable four-year institutions.



**Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC (Success Rate)
1997, 1998 and 1999 Graduating Cohorts**

The table at right displays those first-time, full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen who graduated within 150% of normal program time, transferred out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The “Achieves” range for the 1999 cohort for these institutions was 50% to 65%.



State Technical and Comprehensive Education System - 1997, 1998 and 1999 Graduating Cohorts (Success Rate) The figures below represent the percent of first-time, full-time degree-seeking undergraduate freshmen who graduated within 150% of normal program time, transferred out within 150% of normal program time or continued enrollment following 150% of normal program time. The “Achieves” range for the 1999 cohort for these institutions was 30% to 45%.





Table 7.1 – Graduation Within 150% of Program Time (GRS Rate), Regional Campuses and Technical Colleges.

This table presents the GRS graduation rates for the Regional and Technical College sectors. These data were not used in calculating performance scores.

Graduation Within 150% of Program Time - 1999 Student Cohort			
Regional Campuses		Technical Institutions	
USC Beaufort*	13.3%	Aiken Tech	8.3%
USC Lancaster	35.8%	Central Carolina Tech	12.6%
USC Salkehatchie	25.4%	Denmark Tech	17.9%
USC Sumter	33.2%	Florence-Darlington	11.4%
USC Union	29.1%	Greenville Tech	10.8%
Total	31.6%	Horry-Georgetown Tech	17.9%
*USC Beaufort was a Two-Year institution at the time of the enrollment of the 1999 cohort.		Midlands Tech	8.4%
		Northeastern Tech	15.8%
		Orangeburg-Calhoun	22.0%
		Piedmont Tech	19.7%
		Spartanburg Tech	19.3%
		Tech Coll. of LowCountry	13.1%
		Tri-County Tech	18.2%
		Trident Tech	12.9%
		Williamsburg Tech	13.0%
		York Tech	9.2%
		Total	13.2%

Graduation Rate – Research, Teaching, and Two-Year Institutions (Southern Regional Education Board)

Southern Regional Education Board States Compared to South Carolina

South Carolina is a member of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), which is comprised of 16 states in the southeast. The SREB collects data on an annual basis on various types of information from all member institutions and publishes it in their “SREB State Data Exchange.” The following table (7.2) on graduation rates is taken from the 2002 – 2003 publication.

Table 7.2 - Southern Regional Education Board States Compared to South Carolina
Source: 2002 - 2003 SREB State Data Exchange

Progression Rates for Full-Time, First-Time, Bachelor's Seeking Undergraduates ¹ All Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities – 1995 Cohort			
	% Completing a Bachelor's at Institution of Initial Enrollment W/in 150% of Normal Time	% Still Enrolled at Institution of Initial Enrollment	% Transfers
SREB States	48	6	17
Alabama	49		4
Arkansas	32	8	25
Delaware	66		
Florida	55	5	14
Georgia	42	7	24
Kentucky	44	7	17
Louisiana	34		2
Maryland	54	3	17
Mississippi	47	8	
North Carolina	57	3	16
Oklahoma	42	21 ²	28
South Carolina	55		
Tennessee	43		12
Texas	45	6	32
Virginia	63	3	16
West Virginia	43	7	13

¹ Members of the initial cohort who were deceased, became totally and permanently disabled, left school to serve in the armed forces or a federal foreign aid service such as the Peace Corps, or who left school to serve on an official church mission are subtracted from the cohort before percentages are calculated. Members of the initial cohort who completed only an award below the baccalaureate level, those who completed a bachelor's but not within 150 percent of normal time are not counted in the columns shown.

² Includes students enrolled anytime during the “150 percent” year.

Graduation Rate – Senior and Two-Year Institutions - Southern Regional Education Board (cont.)

Progression Rates for Full-Time, First-Time, Degree or Certificate Seeking Undergraduates ¹ Public Two Year Institutions – 1998 Cohort

	% Completing a Degree or Certificate less than Bachelor's or Equivalent Degree at Institution of Initial Enrollment W/in 150% of Normal Time	% Still Enrolled at Institution of Initial Enrollment	% Transfer
SREB States	17	10	17
Alabama	17		18
Arkansas	19	15	14
Delaware	9		
Florida	30	15	12
Georgia	15	11	26
Kentucky	10	14	25
Louisiana	5		7
Maryland	11	15	12
Mississippi	22		22
North Carolina	19		5
Oklahoma	20	29 ²	23
South Carolina	15		4
Tennessee	11		21
Texas	12	15	26
Virginia	15	16	12
West Virginia	17	8	14

¹ Members of the initial cohort who were deceased, became totally and permanently disabled, left school to serve in the armed forces or the federal foreign aid service such as the Peace Corps, or who left school to serve on an official church mission are subtracted from the cohort before percentages are calculated. Members of the cohort who completed only an award but not within 150 percent of normal time and those who did not earn any certificate or degree and are not still enrolled are not counted in the columns show.

² Includes students enrolled anytime during the “150 percent” year.

Student Performance on Professional Examinations

The following tables (7.3 - 7.5) summarize graduates’ performances on various professional examinations. These examinations are designed to measure minimum knowledge necessary for licensing or to practice in the designated profession. Institutions are required to report data on first-time test takers (with the exception of the PRAXIS Series, which includes all test takers) for the set time period. The Commission on Higher Education (CHE) obtains comparable data (when available) on national and state pass rates for each exam reported. These data are displayed in Table 7.5. The following table lists data from each institution on individual exams taken between April 1 – March 31 of the years reported. For **Performance Funding Indicator 7D – Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests**, data displayed in Table 7.3 are collapsed by CHE to provide a single overall passing average for institutions as shown in Table 7.6.

Table 7.3 – Student Performance on Professional Examinations by Exam by Year for SC’s Public Institutions
Source: Institutional IE Reports to CHE

The following table lists data from each institution on individual exams taken between April 1 – March 31 of the years reported . Exam data from the most recent three-year period are included. Data for exams reported in timeframes not corresponding to the April-March period (e.g., “Jan-Jun 2001” or “ongoing during 2002 or 2003”) were included as data reported from April to December of the year reported. Some historical information has been updated to reflect verified data.

<i>Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed</i>										
Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
ACC National Certif. Exam. in Nurse Midwifery	MUSC							6	5	83.3%
Aircraft Maintenance - Airframe	Greenville Tech	6	6	100.0%	2	2	100.0%			
	Trident Tech				4	4	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
Aircraft Maintenance - General	Greenville Tech	5	4	80.0%	2	1	50.0%			
	Trident Tech	11	11	100.0%	3	3	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
Aircraft Maintenance - Powerplant	Greenville Tech	4	3	75.0%	1	1	100.0%			
	Trident Tech				1	1	100.0%	2	2	100.0%
American Bd of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam Part I (PBSE)	MUSC	7	6	85.7%	7	7	100.0%	8	8	100.0%
American Bd of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam Part II (CAPE)	MUSC	4	4	100.0%	4	4	100.0%	9	9	100.0%
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam-Adult Nurse Practitioner	USC Columbia	1	1	100.0%						
	MUSC							8	8	100.0%
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam-Family Nurse Practitioner	USC Columbia	17	15	88.2%	11	10	90.9%	36	33	91.7%
	Clemson				19	19	100.0%			

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam-Family Nurse Practitioner	MUSC							26	25	96.2%
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam-Gereontological Nurse Practitioner	Clemson MUSC				6	6	100.0%			
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam-Acute Care Nurse Practitioner	USC Columbia	8	8	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	10	9	90.0%
American Nurses Credentialing Center Nat'l Exam – Pediatric Nurse Practitioner	MUSC							4	4	100.0%
Barbering	Denmark Tech	6	5	83.3%	8	8	100.0%	9	8	88.9%
Certification Exam. For Entry Level Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (CRTT)	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech	9	3	33.3%	8	2	25.0%	13	13	100.0%
	Midlands Tech Orangeburg-Calhoun	1	1	100.0%	10	9	90.0%	6	5	83.3%
	Piedmont Tech Spartanburg Tech	8	7	87.5%	5	5	100.0%	10	9	90.0%
	Tri-County Tech	5	3	60.0%	6	6	100.0%	8	1	12.5%
	Trident Tech				8	6	75.0%	6	6	100.0%
					1	0	0.0%	11	4	36.4%
					2	2	100.0%			
Certified Dental Assistant <i>Due to reporting issues with the Dental Assistant National Board, Inc., these scores will not be reported this year.</i>	Aiken Tech									
	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech									
	Midlands Tech Spartanburg Tech									
	Tri-County Tech									
Certified Medical Assistant Exam.	Central Carolina	1	1	100.0%	3	2	66.7%	10	7	70.0%
	Midlands Tech Orangeburg-Calhoun	4	3	75.0%	2	1	50.0%	5	2	40.0%
	Spartanburg Tech				1	1	100.0%	8	4	50.0%
	Trident Tech	11	11	100.0%	8	5	62.5%	8	7	87.5%
		5	5	100.0%	19	14	73.7%	12	12	100.0%
Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant (COTA)	Greenville Tech	7	4	57.1%	8	6	75.0%	19	16	84.2%
	Trident Tech	4	4	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	10	7	70.0%
Clinical Laboratory Scientist/Generalist, NCA	MUSC				12	12	100.0%	12	12	100.0%

Section 7 – Graduates' Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
Clinical Laboratory Technician, NCA	Greenville Tech									
	Trident Tech						14	13	92.9%	
Cosmetology Examination	Denmark Tech	27	26	96.3%	27	20	74.1%	30	21	70.0%
	Florence-Darlington Tech Coll of Low Ctry	28	26	92.9%				4	4	100.0%
	Trident Tech	25	22	88.0%	23	20	87.0%	3	3	100.0%
	Williamsburg Tech	5	5	100.0%	16	14	87.5%	5	5	100.0%
					4	2	50.0%	8	8	100.0%
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists Exam.	USC Columbia				18	16	88.9%	14	12	85.7%
	MUSC	17	16	94.1%	10	10	100.0%	13	13	100.0%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Basic	Greenville Tech	26	19	73.1%				17	15	88.2%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Intermediate	Greenville Tech	24	14	58.3%	15	7	46.7%	17	14	82.4%
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Paramedic	Greenville Tech	8	6	75.0%	12	9	75.0%	10	8	80.0%
Medical Laboratory Technician, ASCP	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech				6	4	66.7%	4	3	75.0%
	Midlands Tech	9	9	100.0%	5	4	80.0%	2	1	50.0%
	Orangeburg-Calhoun Tech	7	7	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	6	4	66.7%
	Spartanburg Tech	6	6	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	5	4	80.0%
	Tri-County Tech	5	5	100.0%	5	5	100.0%	4	4	100.0%
	Trident Tech	8	7	87.5%	12	10	83.3%	8	8	100.0%
	York Tech				4	4	100.0%			
					7	7	100.0%	6	6	100.0%
Medical Technologist, ASCP	MUSC				14	14	100.0%	12	12	100.0%
Multi-State Pharmacy Jurisprudence Exam (MPJE)	USC Columbia	68	63	92.6%	70	65	92.9%	69	65	94.2%
	MUSC	57	51	89.5%	46	42	91.3%	21	20	95.2%
National Board Dental Exam. Part I	MUSC	51	45	88.2%	54	50	92.6%	55	51	92.7%
National Board Dental Exam. Part II	MUSC	52	52	100.0%	49	46	93.9%	53	51	96.2%
National Bd for Dental Hygiene Exam.	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech	15	14	93.3%	15	15	100.0%	15	13	86.7%
	Horry-Georgetown	38	36	94.7%	29	29	100.0%	64	54	84.4%
		15	12	80.0%	14	13	92.9%			
	Midlands Tech	24	24	100.0%	23	22	95.7%	57	54	94.7%

Section 7 – Graduates' Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
National Bd for Dental Hygiene Exam. (cont)	Trident Tech	18	18	100.0%	19	18	94.7%	35	32	91.4%
	York Tech	11	11	100.0%	19	19	100.0%	14	13	92.9%
National Council Licensure Exam.-Practical Nurse *****	Aiken Tech				19	19	100.0%	14	14	100.0%
	Central Carolina	11	10	90.9%	10	9	90.0%	14	14	100.0%
	Florence- Darlington Greenville Tech	81	79	97.5%	98	98	100.0%	9	9	100.0%
	Horry- Georgetown	12	10	83.3%	45	44	97.8%	49	44	89.8%
	Midlands Tech	17	13	76.5%	4	3	75.0%	21	21	100.0%
	Northeastern ¹	53	51	96.2%	57	55	96.5%	47	46	97.9%
	Orangeburg- Calhoun	15	14	93.3%	17	12	70.6%	21	15	71.4%
	Piedmont Tech	17	15	88.2%	22	17	77.3%	21	20	95.2%
	Spartanburg Tech	26	22	84.6%	22	17	77.3%	21	21	100.0%
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	29	22	75.9%	21	17	81.0%	22	17	77.3%
	Tri-County Tech	9	9	100.0%	11	10	90.9%	14	13	92.9%
	Trident Tech	19	18	94.7%	14	12	85.7%	15	15	100.0%
					41	35	85.4%	35	33	94.3%
National Council Licensure Exam.- Registered Nurse (BSN)	Clemson	92	85	92.4%	69	64	92.8%	67	59	88.1%
	USC Columbia	42	36	85.7%	76	64	84.2%	96	78	81.3%
	MUSC	74	65	87.8%	88	72	81.8%	85	70	82.4%
	Lander	16	16	100.0%	27	26	96.3%	25	21	84.0%
	SC State USC	26	13	50.0%	12	8	66.7%	9	5	55.6%
	Spartanburg	101	97	96.0%	57	43	75.4%	38	22	57.9%
National Council Licensure Exam.- Registered Nurse (ADN) ***USC Lancaster only	USC Aiken	56	44	78.6%	47	38	80.9%	70	55	78.6%
	USC Spartanburg	54	54	100.0%	31	28	90.3%	47	44	93.6%
	USC Lancaster / York Tech ²	13	11	84.6%	11	10	90.9%	28	27	96.4%
	Central Carolina	37	35	94.6%	42	42	100.0%	32	31	96.9%
	Florence- Darlington Greenville Tech	83	80	96.4%	111	111	100.0%	102	81	79.4%
	Horry- Georgetown	141	134	95.0%	125	114	91.2%	87	76	87.4%
	Midlands Tech	71	66	93.0%	55	47	85.5%	36	34	94.4%
	Orangeburg- Calhoun	103	99	96.1%	134	122	91.0%	117	102	87.2%
	Piedmont Tech	41	40	97.6%	39	33	84.6%	35	30	85.7%
	Tech Coll of Low Ctry	31	24	77.4%	34	34	100.0%	43	41	95.3%
	Tri-County Tech	27	26	96.3%	24	24	100.0%	28	25	89.3%
	Trident Tech	42	35	83.3%	55	51	92.7%	50	46	92.0%
	York Tech				111	104	93.7%	80	78	97.5%
					25	23	92.0%	28	27	96.4%
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT)	MUSC	62	58	93.5%	72	65	90.3%	94	80	85.1%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
National Physical Therapist Assistant Exam (PTA)	Greenville Tech	27	24	88.9%	30	24	80.0%	30	24	80.0%
	Midlands Tech	6	4	66.7%				10	10	100.0%
	Trident Tech	3	3	100.0%	9	7	77.8%	26	21	80.8%
Neonatal Nurse Practitioner Exam.	MUSC**						6	6	100.0%	
North American Pharmacist Licensure Exam. (NAPLEX)	USC Columbia	62	59	95.2%	55	55	100.0%	35	34	97.1%
	MUSC	56	51	91.1%	26	26	100.0%	12	11	91.7%
Nuclear Medicine Technology, ARRT	Midlands Tech	8	7	87.5%	9	8	88.9%			
Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Board Exam.	Midlands Tech	9	9	100.0%	11	10	90.9%	6	5	83.3%
Nurse Aid Competency Evaluation Program (NACEP)	Orangeburg-Calhoun	13	13	100.0%	7	7	100.0%			
Occupational Therapy, Registered (OTR)	MUSC	35	30	85.7%	32	29	90.6%	38	35	92.1%
Physician Assistant National Certifying Exam.	MUSC	37	36	97.3%	34	33	97.1%	36	36	100.0%
PRAXIS Series II: Core Battery Professional Knowledge	Clemson									
<i>This test was not used in Performance Funding in 2001 - 02 or 02-03. Please refer to the PLT Exams below.</i>	USC Columbia									
	Citadel									
	Coastal Carolina Coll. of Charleston									
	Francis Marion									
	Lander									
	SC State									
	USC Aiken									
	USC Spartanburg									
	Winthrop									
Praxis Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (K-6)	Clemson	191	170	89.0%	10	6	60.0%	11	10	90.9%
	USC Columbia	31	31	100.0%	52	47	90.4%	111	103	92.8%
	Coastal Carolina Coll. of Charleston	2	2	100.0%	3	3	100.0%	16	12	75.0%
	Charleston	40	36	90.0%	26	20	76.9%	44	41	93.2%
	Francis Marion				5	5	100.0%			
	Lander	6	6	100.0%	3	3	100.0%	10	6	60.0%
	SC State				12	4	33.3%			
	USC Aiken	9	9	100.0%	12	12	100.0%	6	3	50.0%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
Praxis Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (5-9) <i>These scores will not be used for performance. funding scoring in Year 7</i>	USC Spartanburg	69	55	79.7%	42	36	85.7%	42	38	90.5%
	Winthrop	122	115	94.3%	89	76	85.4%			
	USC Columbia	4	3	75.0%	8	4	50.0%	5	3	60.0%
	Coastal Carolina Coll. of Charleston	1	1	100.0%				1	0	0.0%
	Lander	3	3	100.0%	1	0	0.0%	4	3	75.0%
	Lander	1	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
	USC Aiken									
	USC Spartanburg	2	1	50.0%				1	0	0.0%
	Winthrop	3	3	100.0%	5	4				
	Praxis Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (7-12) <i>These scores will not be used for performance. funding scoring in Year 7</i>	Clemson	95	74	77.9%	34	29	85.3%	7	7
USC Columbia		37	33	89.2%	31	27	87.1%	84	67	79.8%
The Citadel		4	4	100.0%	10	10	100.0%	4	3	0.8%
Coastal Carolina Coll. Of Charleston		1	1	100.0%				7	5	71.4%
Charleston		7	7	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	5	4	80.0%
Francis Marion					1	1	100.0%	2	1	50.0%
Lander		2	1	50.0%	2	2	100.0%	8	7	87.5%
SC State					7	5	71.4%			
USC Aiken		2	1	50.0%	3	3	100.0%	18	16	88.9%
USC Spartanburg		8	5	62.5%	13	9	69.2%	18	16	88.9%
Winthrop	170	155	91.2%	45	39	86.7%	63	49	77.8%	
PRAXIS Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests	Clemson	357	317	88.8%	404	351	86.9%	450	404	89.8%
	USC Columbia	364	357	98.1%	346	336	97.1%	409	394	96.3%
	Citadel	119	96	80.7%	137	107	78.1%	115	96	83.5%
	Coastal Carolina Coll. of Charleston	123	112	91.1%	47	42	89.4%	75	60	80.0%
	Charleston	294	274	93.2%	240	220	91.7%	343	304	88.6%
	Francis Marion				136	109	80.1%	122	93	76.2%
	Lander	57	51	89.5%	91	81	89.0%	52	40	76.9%
	SC State	49	49	100.0%	125	100	80.0%	128	121	94.5%
	USC Aiken	122	107	87.7%	131	117	89.3%	89	79	88.8%
	USC Spartanburg	132	106	80.3%	126	102	81.0%	168	125	74.4%
Winthrop	228	215	94.3%	290	267	92.1%	185	180	97.3%	
PRAXIS- Specialty Area (Speech-Language Path.)	MUSC	13	13	100.0%	11	10	90.9%	12	12	100.0%
Radiography Exam., ARRT	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech	13	12	92.3%	13	11	84.6%	10	10	100.0%
	Horry-Georgetown	14	13	92.9%	20	19	95.0%	17	15	88.2%
	Georgetown	13	13	100.0%	9	8	88.9%	9	7	77.8%
	Midlands Tech	14	14	100.0%	12	12	100.0%	13	13	100.0%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
Radiography Exam., ARRT (cont)	Orangeburg-Calhoun	5	3	60.0%	8	8	100.0%	9	8	88.9%
	Piedmont Tech	10	9	90.0%				5	5	100.0%
	Spartanburg Tech	12	11	91.7%	6	6	100.0%	7	7	100.0%
	Trident Tech	14	14	100.0%	22	20	90.9%			
	York Tech	10	10	100.0%	8	8	100.0%	8	8	100.0%
Registered Health Information Technician (Formerly Accredited Record Technician)	Florence-Darlington	1	1	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	10	3	30.0%
	Greenville Tech	2	2	100.0%	13	11	84.6%	9	6	66.7%
	Midlands Tech	8	5	62.5%	9	8	88.9%	13	13	100.0%
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Clinical Simulation (previously known as "Respiratory Care Adv.-Clinical Simulation")	Florence-Darlington							14	14	100.0%
	Greenville Tech	3	3	100.0%	6	4	66.7%	2	1	50.0%
	Midlands Tech	4	3	75%	6	4	66.7%	1	1	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech Spartanburg Tech				3	3	100.0%			
	Trident Tech	9	7	77.8%	2	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%
					1	1	100.0%			
Registry Exam. for Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Written Registry	Florence-Darlington									
	Greenville Tech	3	3	100.0%	7	7	100.0%	1	1	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	4	4	100.0%	4	3	75.0%	3	3	100.0%
	Piedmont Tech Spartanburg Tech				3	2	66.7%			
	Trident Tech	8	4	50.0%						
South Carolina Board of Law Examination	USC Columbia	402	331	82.3%	177	162	91.5%	231	196	84.8%
Cytotechnology (ASCP) <i>In 2001-2002, changed from "Specialist in Cytotechnology."</i> SRTA Regional Exam. for Dental Hygienists	MUSC	10	10	100.0%	6	6	100.0%	5	5	100.0%
	Florence-Darlington	14	14	100.0%	15	15	100.0%	10	9	90.0%
	Greenville Tech	20	19	95.0%	19	19	100.0%	41	41	100.0%
	Midlands Tech	25	24	96.0%	25	23	92.0%	29	28	96.6%
	Trident Tech	19	19	100.0%	21	21	100.0%			
	York Tech	11	11	100.0%	6	5	83.3%	7	6	85.7%
State Board Dental Exam-SRTA Exam	MUSC	48	28	58.3%	54	41	75.9%	61	49	80.3%
State Board Exam. for Dental Hygiene - SC Bd of Dentistry	Florence-Darlington							5	4	80.0%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exams taken between April 1 and March 31 of year listed

Exam Title	Institution	2002-2003			2001-2002			2000-2001		
		#	#	%	#	#	%	#	#	%
		Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing	Tested	Passing	Passing
<i>No longer administered</i>	Greenville Tech Horry-Georgetown Midlands Tech York Tech				14	13	92.9%			
Surgical Technologist National Certifying Exam.	Central Carolina Tech	7	4	57.1%	6	3	50.0%	4	3	75.0%
	Florence-Darlington Greenville Tech	6	6	100.0%	5	5	100.0%	10	10	100.0%
	Tech	21	17	81.0%	4	3	75.0%	8	7	87.5%
	Midlands Tech	4	3	75.0%	1	1	100.0%	10	8	80.0%
	Piedmont Tech Spartanburg Tech Tri-County Tech	10	10	100.0%	13	13	100.0%	10	9	90.0%
					1	1	100.0%	11	5	45.5%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step I	USC Columbia	69	64	92.8%	71	70	98.6%	72	68	94.4%
	MUSC	138	122	88.4%	130	121	93.1%	132	119	90.2%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step II	USC Columbia	72	71	98.6%	72	68	94.4%	71	70	98.6%
	MUSC				137	125	91.2%	137	125	91.2%
Veterinary Technician National Examination	Tri-County Tech	10	9	90.0%	11	11	100.0%	13	12	92.3%

¹ Northeastern Technical College was formerly Chesterfield-Marlboro Technical College

² Joint nursing program with USC Lancaster and York Tech

³ These examinations make up Indicator 3E2a for Teaching Sector institutions.

⁴ These examinations make up Indicator 3E2b for Teaching Sector institutions

National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations

The following table lists national and South Carolina pass rates of graduates and/or prospective graduates on professional and certification examinations. Data reported are generally derived from the same time frame as requested from the institutions – April 1 – March 31 – and have been compiled from agency reports to the CHE. For data that may have crossed over the April – March reporting period or for a change in exam title, a footnote is provided at the end of the table. Calendar year reports that do not correspond to the April – March timeframe are included in the April – December time period for the appropriate year (e.g., Jan. - June 1997 summary data are included in 1997-98 data). Some agencies do not maintain national or state pass rates and thus cannot report them to the CHE. In these cases, “NA” is listed. An empty space is left when an agency did not respond to CHE requests by the printing of this report. Each exam listed has been reported by state institutions at least once in the past. Some historical information has been updated to reflect verified data.

Table 7.4 - National and South Carolina Pass Rates on Professional Examinations
Source: Examination agencies’ reports to CHE

Exam Title	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		Difference
	National	SC	National	SC	National	SC	
ACC National Certification Exam. In Nurse Midwifery					91%	83%	
Accredited Record Technician	See Registered Health Information Technician						
Aircraft Maintenance-Airframe	94%	100%	94%	100%	93%	93%	6%
Aircraft Maintenance-General	94%	94%	93%	100%	92%	96%	0%
Aircraft Maintenance-Powerplant	93%	92%	93%	75%	93%	91%	0%
American Bd. of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam - Part I (PBSE)		86%		100%	65%	100%	
American Bd. of Cardiovascular Perfusion Exam - Part II (CAPE)		100%		100%	86%	100%	
American Nurses Credentialing Center National Exam - Acute Care Nurse Practitioner		100%		100%		N/A	
American Nurses Credentialing Center National Exam - Family Nurse Practitioner	86%	88%	79%	97%			2%
American Nurses Credentialing Center National Exam - Gerontological Nurse Practitioner				100%			
Barbering		83%	61%	100%	63%	41%	
Certification Exam. for Entry Level Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (CRTT)		67%		87%	0%	0%	
Certified Dental Assistant			82%	96%	65%	88%	
Certified Medical Assistant Exam.		95%		70%	0%	0%	
Certified Occupational Therapist Assistant (COTA)		73%		88%			
Clinical Laboratory Scientist/Generalist, NCA (previously known "Medical Technology, NCA")				100%			
Clinical Laboratory Technician, NCA		100%					
Cosmetology Examination		93%	70%	80%	72%	66%	
Council on Certification of Nurse Anesthetists Exam.		94%	91%	93%			
Cytotechnology (ASCP)				100%		100%	
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Basic		73%			69%	70%	
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Intermediate		58%		47%	65%	56%	
Emergency Medical Technician - NREMT Paramedic		75%		75%	72%	60%	
Medical Laboratory Technician ASCP		98%		93%			
Medical Technologist ASCP				100%			
Multi-state Pharmacy Jurisprudence Exam (MPJE)		91%		92%		94%	
National Board Dental Exam. Part I		88%	91%	93%			
National Board Dental Exam. Part II		100%	92%	94%			
National Board for Dental Hygiene Exam.		95%	89%	97%			
National Council Licensure Exam - Practical Nurse	85%	89%	86%	91%	85%	93%	15%
National Council Licensure Exam - Registered Nurse (ADN)	85%	93%	86%	93%		89%	8%

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Exam Title	2002-2003		2001-2002		2000-2001		
National Council Licensure Exam - Registered Nurse (BSN)		89%		84%	84%	80%	
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT)		94%	91%	90%	92%	90%	
National Physical Therapist Licensing Exam. (PT Asst.)	96%	86%	71%	80%	74%	22%	-10%
Neonatal Nurse Practitioner Exam							
North American Pharmacist Licensure Exam	97%	93%		100%		96%	-3%
Nuclear Medicine Technology AART	90%	88%	92%	89%	90%		-2%
Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Bd. Exam.		100%	90%	91%		83%	
Nurse Aid Competency Evaluation Program		100%	85%	100%			
Occupational Therapy, Registered (OTR)		86%		91%		92%	
Physician Assistant National Certifying Exam. (PANCE)		97%	88%	97%	92%	100%	
Praxis Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests		91%		88%		88%	
Praxis Series II: Subject Assessment/Specialty Area Tests (Speech Path)		100%		91%		100%	
Radiography Exam ARRT	89%	94%	88%	94%	88%	88%	6%
Registered Health Information Technician	88%	73%	90%	87%		69%	-15%
Registry Exam. For Entry Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (CRTT)							
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Clinical Simulation		81%		67%		94%	
Registry Exam. For Advanced Respiratory Therapy Practitioners (RRT) - Written Registry		73%		86%		100%	
SRTA Regional Exam. for Dental Hygienists		98%		96%			
South Carolina Board of Law Examination	N/A	80%	N/A	92%	N/A	80%	
State Board Dental Exam.-SRTA Exam. (previously known "SC Board of Dentistry")		58%	N/A	76%		80%	
State Board Exam. For Dental Hygienists-SC Bd of Dentistry		96%	N/A	96%		97%	
Surgical Technologist National Certifying Exam		83%		84%		85%	
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step I	92%	90%	91%	95%		92%	-2%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step II	97%	99%	95%	92%		94%	2%
US Medical Licensing Exam. - Step III			94%				
Veterinary Technician National Exam		90%	84%	100%		92%	

¹Based on pass rates reported by public colleges.

²This is reported for 2001 calendar year.

Overall Passing Percentage on Professional Examinations by Year for SC’s Public Institutions

Table 7.5 - Percentage of students taking certification examinations who pass the examinations

Source: Institutional Effectiveness Reports

	Percentage Passing Examinations taken from April 1 to March 31				Percent Change		
	2002 - 03	2001- 02	2000- 01	1999- 00	2001-02 to 2002- 03	1999-00 to 2002- 03	2000-01 to 2001- 02
Research Institutions							
Clemson	87.8%	88.4%	89.6%	91.2%	-0.6%	-3.4%	-1.2%
USC Columbia	91.1%	94.4%	91.9%	90.9%	-3.3%	0.2%	2.5%
MUSC	88.8%	90.7%	90.8%	90.4%	-1.9%	-1.6%	-0.1%
Teaching Institutions							
Citadel	81.3%	78.1%	83.5%	82.2%	3.2%	-0.9%	-5.4%
Coastal Carolina	91.3%	89.4%	80.0%	79.1%	1.9%	12.2%	9.4%
College of Charleston	93.0%	91.7%	88.6%	92.5%	1.3%	0.5%	3.1%
Francis Marion	100.0%	80.1%	76.2%	80.0%	19.9%	20.0%	3.9%
Lander	90.2%	90.7%	79.2%	86.2%	-0.5%	4.0%	11.5%
SC State	82.6%	78.8%	92.0%	89.7%	3.8%	-7.1%	-13.2%
USC Aiken	85.2%	87.1%	84.3%	90.2%	-1.9%	-5.0%	2.8%
USC Beaufort	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
USC Spartanburg	84.6%	80.8%	79.4%	89.3%	3.8%	-4.7%	1.4%
Winthrop	92.9%	92.1%	97.3%	90.0%	0.8%	2.9%	-5.2%
Two-year Branch Campuses							
USC Lancaster	84.6%	90.9%	96.4%	96.0%	-6.3%	-11.4%	-5.5%
USC Salkehatchie				N/A			
USC Sumter				N/A			
USC Union				N/A			
Technical Colleges							
Aiken	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	86.4%	-16.7%	-3.1%	0.0%
Central Carolina	89.2%	91.8%	91.7%	94.5%	-2.6%	-5.3%	0.1%
Denmark	93.9%	80.0%	88.9%	68.4%	13.9%	25.5%	-8.9%
Florence-Darlington	94.8%	96.3%	84.0%	81.6%	-1.5%	13.2%	12.3%
Greenville	87.0%	88.4%	86.5%	83.9%	-1.4%	3.1%	1.9%
Horry-Georgetown	89.6%	87.5%	93.9%	87.1%	2.1%	2.5%	-6.4%
Midlands	96.3%	92.1%	91.1%	87.3%	4.2%	9.0%	1.0%
Northeastern	93.3%	70.6%	71.4%	77.8%	22.7%	15.5%	-0.8%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	91.9%	87.6%	77.9%	81.5%	4.3%	10.4%	9.7%
Piedmont	93.1%	88.6%	97.3%	87.3%	4.5%	5.8%	-8.7%
Spartanburg	83.3%	82.1%	77.8%	89.5%	1.2%	-6.2%	4.3%
Tech Coll. of LowCountry	93.4%	93.1%	91.1%	86.4%	0.3%	7.0%	2.0%
Tri-County	86.0%	91.4%	88.7%	85.7%	-5.4%	0.3%	2.7%
Trident	100.0%	90.9%	91.7%	90.8%	9.1%	9.2%	-0.8%
Williamsburg	N/A	50.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	

N/A – Institution had no students take an examination in this time frame.

Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests


Indicator 7D, Scores of Graduates on Post-Undergraduate Professional, Graduate, or Employment-Related Examinations and Certification Tests, measures the overall percentage of students at an institution taking certification examinations who pass the examinations. The data are taken from the individual tests as reported by each institution and displayed in Table 7.3. Because of the wide variety in the number of students, programs and examinations across institutions as evident in Table 7.3, the reader is cautioned against making direct comparisons of the overall percentage passing across institutions. Some historical information has been updated to reflect verified data. This chart does not include results from the PRAXIS PLT exams or from the DANBE.

Figure 7.2 – Results of Professional Examinations used for Performance Funding Indicator 7D


The charts below indicate the Pass Rate used to determine Performance Funding scores earned by institutions on Indicator 7D for the 1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002 performance years. Data for these performance years comes from the preceding April – March period.

The range for an “Achieves” for these institutions for Year 7 performance funding was 75-89%.

Research Institutions




Four-Year Colleges and Universities





*1999-2000 data corrected per data verification, June 2002

Two-Year Branch Campuses of USC



USC – Lancaster was the only one of the branch campuses to have programs in which students took professional examinations.

Technical College System



* Williamsburg Technical College had no students take professional examinations in 1999-2000.


Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education

For Performance Year 7 (2002-2003), an indicator was developed to recognize the unique role played by the Regional Campus sector in preparing and transferring students to the state’s four-year campuses. This indicator is defined as:

Percentage of first-time, full-time degree-seeking students who earn a baccalaureate degree within 150% of normal program time (6 years for a baccalaureate degree) from in-state public institutions or from other institutions provided appropriate documentation can be presented by the reporting regional campus. (Performance Funding Workbook, September 2002, p II 167.)

Figure 7.3 – Performance Funding Indicator 7E: Number of Graduates Who Continued Their Education

USC Beaufort is included in this measure. The range for an “Achieves” is from 25% to 40%. Performance above the range score “Exceeds.”



Graduates' Achievements - Placement Data on Graduates

The following table summarizes placement data on graduates from public, senior institutions. These institutions of higher learning are required to report placement data on graduates and most institutions include these data as part of their alumni follow-up survey reports. The responses here are derived from graduates of three years prior to the reporting year (i.e., 1999-2000 graduates). The responses are taken directly from the alumni survey at each institution. The standard survey contains five questions, all of which are provided below. The institutions were asked to report on the number of responses received on each question, but only the percentages of the total responses are shown below. Since programs at the two-year campuses of USC are intended primarily to prepare students for continuing their baccalaureate studies, placement data have not been collected for those institutions. The data shown here provide an overview of what graduates from South Carolina's public, senior institutions are doing upon their commencement.

Francis Marion University shows no results due to an extremely low response rate to an on-line survey.

Table 7.6 - Placement Data on Graduates Source: Institutional Reports to CHE

1999-2000 Academic Year Survey Administration

	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
Number Surveyed		1320	197	537	445	1676		350	694	445	52	629	597
% Response Rate Based on Sample (S) or Total Group (P)		22.3	36	20.5	15.7	20.5		16	20.2	27.9	21.2	31.5	19
		S	P	P	S	P		P	P	P	P	P	P

Time to obtain first full-time job after graduation

<i>% of Total Represented</i>	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
Prior to leaving college	41.3	34.5	62.9	59.3	24.2	27.9		46.4	31.9	40.9	18.2	43.9	34.5
Less than 1 month	9.8	10.9	20	6.5	7.6	12.9		10.7	15.9	20	9.1	9.6	18.6
1 to 3 months	25.2	19.1	11.4	12	27.3	23.5		21.4	24.6	15.5	9.1	17.7	19.5
4 to 6 months	8.4	12.3		5.6	10.6	12.1		7.1	5.1	8.2	18.2	10.1	8.8
7 to 12 months	2.8	5.1	2.9	0.9	7.6	6.8		7.1	4.3	7.3	18.2	6.6	5.3
Over 12 months	2.1	4.1	1.4	1.9	10.6	5.3		1.8	4.3	2.7	0	4	1.8
Not obtained a full-time job	4.2	2.4		2.8	12.1	2.6			0.7	2.7	0	1.5	0.9
Did not seek a full-time job	6.3	11.6	1.4	11.1		8.8		5.4	13	2.7	27.3	6.6	10.6

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements

Single category that best describes student's current status

<i>% of Total Represented</i>	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
Continuing education full-time	13.3	17.6	8.3	8.3	0	8.2		1.8	9.4	2.7	9.1	2.5	8.8
Employed & continuing education	18.9	3.9	16.7	16.5	11.8	24.2		12.5	36.2	23	9.1	23.7	24.8
Employed full-time	58	70.6	66.7	53.2	29.4	60.1		71.4	39.9	63.7	54.5	57.6	55.8
Employed part-time	0.7	2	2.8	2.8	5.9	4.2		3.6	2.9	2.7	0	3.5	1.8
Serving in Armed Forces	2.8	0		12.8	2.9	1		1.8	2.2	0	9.1	1	0
Unemployed seeking work	4.9	2.6		0	10.3	0		5.4	9.4	1.8	0	3	4.4
Unemployed not seeking work	0	0		0	5.9	0		0	0	0.9	9.1	0	2.7
Other	0.7	0		0.9	1.5	1.3		0	0	0.9	0	3	1.8

Relationship between the student's college major and first full-time job after graduation

<i>% of Total Represented</i>	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
Highly related	37.9	41.5	80.6	51.4	19.1	34.9		57.1	38.4	65	36.4	57.9	45.5
Moderately related	19.3	20.1	12.9	21.1	32.4	17		19.6	21	7.5	9.1	14.2	14.3
Slightly related	15.7	11.1	6.5	10.1	16.2	12.2		8.9	17.4	11.7	36.4	10.2	10.7
Not related	19.3	20.8		13.8	16.2	29.6		12.5	13.8	13.3	18.2	14.2	23.2
Not employed	7.9	6.6		3.7	16.2	6.3		1.8	9.4	2.5	0	3.6	6.3

Relationship between the student's college major and current full-time job

<i>% of Total Represented</i>	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
Highly related	46	38.9	80.6	51.4	19.1	34.9		57.1	38.4	65	36.4	57.9	45.5
Moderately related	15	18.9	12.9	21.1	32.4	17		19.6	21	7.5	9.1	14.2	14.3
Slightly related	7.1	9.3	6.5	10.1	16.2	12.2		8.9	17.4	11.7	36.4	10.2	10.7
Not related	24.8	23.6		13.8	16.2	29.6		12.5	13.8	13.3	0	14.2	23.2
Not employed	7.1	9.3		3.7	16.2	6.3		1.8	9.4	2.5	18.2	3.6	6.3

Section 7 – Graduates’ Achievements


Location of student's first job after graduation

<i>% of Total Represented</i>	Clemson	USC C	MUSC	Citadel	Coastal	C of Ch.	Fran. Mar.	Lander	SC State	USC A	USC B	USC S	Winthrop
South Carolina	40.6	63.7	87.3	55.1	48.5	56.4		82.1	53.6	75.8	45.5	89.8	60.2
Southeast, outside of SC	28	15.2	9.5	15.9	20.6	18.7		8.9	23.9	18.3	9.1	2.6	26.5
Outside the Southeast	24.5	14.5	3.2	22.4	30.9	19.3		7.1	13	3.3	27.3	3.1	5.3
Not employed	7	6.6		6.5		5.6		1.8	9.4	2.5	18.2	4.6	8

(blank page)

Section 8

User-Friendliness of the Institution



(blank page)

USER-FRIENDLINESS OF THE INSTITUTION

The user-friendliness of institutions is evaluated through performance funding based and institutional effectiveness requirements mandated through Act 255 of 1992, as amended.

Table 8.1, “First-Time Undergraduate Transfers,” summarizes transfer data for first-time, full-time undergraduate students from and to different types of institutions in the state. This information is reported in fulfillment of institutional effectiveness reporting requirements.

Table 8.2 “Enrollment by Race” displays minority enrollment for 1997 and 2002 and the percent change over these years. The number of African-American students increased 29.1% and other Minority students increased 30.1% during the period displayed, while the total higher education population growth was 12.0%. Additional data on student enrollment and faculty are located in the CHE publication, “South Carolina Higher Education Statistical Abstract.”

Performance Funding Indicator 8C – Accessibility to the Institutions of all Citizens of the State, has been defined such that institutions are measured each year on the percentage of undergraduate students who are South Carolina citizens who are minority; the annual retention of undergraduate students who are South Carolina citizens who are degree-seeking; the percent of minority graduate students enrolled; and the percent of minority faculty. Data for the past three years for these performance funding measures are found in Figures 8.1 through 8.4.

Details for the measurement of performance funding indicators are accessible on the web in the annual Performance Funding Workbook.

Undergraduate Transfers

The following table summarizes transfer data for first-time, full-time undergraduate students over the past three years and shows that students continue to transfer among all sectors (public and private) and all levels (two- and four-year) of institutions. Looking at the most recent data from Fall 2002, the largest number of transfer students in the state is those who transfer from out-of-state institutions and come to South Carolina institutions (2,923). This is a decrease from last year (3,758). The second largest transfer group (2,622) starts at South Carolina technical colleges with 52.1% (1,365) going on to senior public institutions, 15.1% (396) going to another technical college, and 15.1% (395) going to a senior private institution.

Table 8.1 First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Transfers
Source: CHEMIS Data

NUMBER TRANSFERRING TO SOUTH CAROLINA'S:						
TRANSFERRING FROM:	Senior Public Institutions	2-Yr Regional Institutions	Technical Colleges	Senior Private Institutions	2-Yr Private Institutions	TOTAL
SC Public Senior Institutions						
Fall 2000	699	70	999	107	2	1,877
Fall 2001	665	67	730	157	3	1,622
Fall 2002	725	28	521	139	21	1,434
SC 2-Yr Regional Campuses						
Fall 2000	375	5	94	11	1	486
Fall 2001	385	6	80	14	0	485
Fall 2002	287	2	39	11	0	339
SC Technical Colleges						
Fall 2000	1,552	106	616	273	5	2,552
Fall 2001	1,608	120	800	366	19	2,913
Fall 2002	1,365	43	396	395	84	2,283
SC Private Senior Institutions						
Fall 2000	296	34	337	98	3	768
Fall 2001	303	23	288	108	9	731
Fall 2002	358	15	217	123	44	757
SC Private 2-Yr Colleges						
Fall 2000	78	4	51	22	0	155
Fall 2001	58	1	38	14	0	111
Fall 2002	86	4	27	22	0	139
SOUTH CAROLINA TRANSFER ACTIVITY						
Fall 2000	3,000	219	2,097	511	11	5,838
Fall 2001	3,019	217	1,936	659	31	5,862
Fall 2002	2,821	92	1,200	690	149	4,952

NUMBER TRANSFERRING TO SOUTH CAROLINA'S:

		Senior Public Institutions	2-Yr Regional Institutions	Technical Colleges	Senior Private Institutions	2-Yr Private Institutions	TOTAL
TRANSFERRING FROM:							
Out-of-State							
Fall 2000		1,466	144	1,440	580	7	3,637
Fall 2001		1,554	134	1372	685	13	3,758
Fall 2002		1,480	22	857	490	74	2,923
Foreign							
Fall 2000		85	27	0	22	0	134
Fall 2001		76	23	0	10	0	109
Fall 2002		34	0	0	11	0	45

Enrollment by Race

Headcount enrollment of African-American, Other Minority (i.e., all nonwhite students) and Total All Students is displayed for the years 1996 and 2001. The percentage change in enrollment is computed for the five-year period. Additional data on enrollment in SC public institutions may be found on-line in the CHE "Higher Education Statistical Abstract for SC" at: <http://www.che400.state.sc.us/web/stats.htm>.

Table 8.2 Source: CHEMIS Data, 1997 and 2002

INSTITUTION	Headcount Enrollment Fall 1997			Headcount Enrollment Fall 2002			Percentage Change, Fall 1997 to Fall 2002		
	Afr- Amer.	Other Minority ¹	Total Enrollment	Afr- Amer.	Other Minority ¹	Total Enrollment	% Change Afr- Amer.	% Change Other Minority ¹	% Change Total Enrollment
Research Universities									
Clemson	1,234	382	16,396	1,199	425	16,876	-2.8%	11.3%	2.9%
USC Columbia	3,960	989	25,447	3,887	1,063	24,140	-1.8%	7.5%	-5.1%
MUSC ²	206	130	2,326	218	143	2,260	5.8%	10.0%	-2.8%
Total, Research	5,400	1,501	44,169	5,304	1,631	43,276	-1.8%	8.7%	-2.0%
Four-Year Colleges and Universities									
Citadel	451	103	3,766	590	206	4,058	30.8%	100.0%	7.8%
Coastal Carolina	400	114	4,408	572	155	5,980	43.0%	36.0%	35.7%
College of Charleston	934	297	10,854	1,025	315	11,716	9.7%	6.1%	7.9%
Francis Marion	929	58	3,554	1,098	67	3,494	18.2%	15.5%	-1.7%
Lander	512	41	2,731	542	43	2,947	5.9%	4.9%	7.9%
SC State	4,294	19	4,657	4,078	27	4,568	-5.0%	42.1%	-1.9%
USC Aiken	557	84	3,004	785	101	3,416	40.9%	20.2%	13.7%
USC Beaufort ³	173	83	1,040	268	90	1,203	54.9%	8.4%	15.7%
USC Spartanburg	612	116	3,729	1,049	172	4,362	71.4%	48.3%	17.0%
Winthrop	1,191	120	5,574	1,571	162	6,462	31.9%	35.0%	15.9%
Total Public, Four-Year Coll. & Univ.	10,053	1,035	43,317	11,578	1,338	48,206	15.2%	29.3%	11.3%
Two-Year Institutions/Branches of USC									
USC Lancaster	180	17	1,057	180	12	943	0.0%	-29.4%	-10.8%
USC Salkehatchie	290	7	837	299	13	747	3.1%	85.7%	-10.8%

Section 8 – User-Friendliness Of The Institution

INSTITUTION	Headcount Enrollment Fall 1997			Headcount Enrollment Fall 2002			Percentage Change, Fall 1997 to Fall 2002		
	Afr- Amer.	Other Minority ¹	Total Enrollment	Afr- Amer.	Other Minority ¹	Total Enrollment	% Change Afr- Amer.	% Change Other Minority ¹	% Change Total Enrollment
USC Sumter	268	60	1,371	288	55	1,149	7.5%	-8.3%	-16.2%
USC Union	38	11	381	67	5	347	76.3%	-54.5%	-8.9%
Total Two-Year Inst. of USC	776	95	3,646	834	85	3,186	7.5%	-10.5%	-12.6%
State Technical College System									
Aiken	828	63	2,463	961	55	2,455	16.1%	-12.7%	-0.3%
Central Carolina	873	56	2,262	1,641	85	3,265	88.0%	51.8%	44.3%
Denmark	1,043	1	1,102	1,326	3	1,404	27.1%	200.0%	27.4%
Florence-Darlington	1,129	41	3,248	1,870	53	4,041	65.6%	29.3%	24.4%
Greenville	1,436	278	8,749	2,536	550	12,043	76.6%	97.8%	37.7%
Horry-Georgetown	638	55	3,338	1,119	79	4,562	75.4%	43.6%	36.7%
Midlands	3,024	327	9,468	3,556	488	10,347	17.6%	49.2%	9.3%
Northeastern	418	12	1,062	425	30	994	1.7%	150.0%	-6.4%
Orangeburg-Calhoun	946	16	1,820	1,329	35	2,279	40.5%	118.8%	25.2%
Piedmont	1,099	39	3,415	1,887	66	4,911	71.7%	69.2%	43.8%
Spartanburg	623	54	2,715	1,127	168	3,871	80.9%	211.1%	42.6%
TCL	650	62	1,822	817	84	1,766	25.7%	35.5%	-3.1%
Tri-County	363	52	3,363	572	80	4,125	57.6%	53.8%	22.7%
Trident	1,900	400	8,730	3,362	504	11,251	76.9%	-85.2%	28.9%
Williamsburg	353	3	588	379	2	517	7.4%	-33.3%	-12.1%
York	772	104	3,476	1,109	154	4,064	43.7%	48.1%	16.9%
Total State Tech. System	16,095	1,563	57,621	24,016	2,436	71,895	49.2%	55.9%	24.8%
GRAND TOTAL	32,324	4,194	148,753	41,732	5,490	166,563	29.1%	30.9%	12.0%

¹ Includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, or Hispanic racial/ethnic designations. Does not include "Unknown" or "Non-Resident Aliens."

² Excludes medical and dental residents and interns.

³ USC Beaufort was a two-year institution in Fall 1997.

Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State

Performance Funding Indicator **8C** – **Accessibility to the Institution of All Citizens of the State**, has four sub-parts.

8C1 - The percent of undergraduate headcount students who are citizens of South Carolina who are minority according to federal reporting definitions and are enrolled at an institution. (Figure 8.1)

8C2 - The annual retention rate of minority, undergraduate students as defined in Part 1 of this measure, but limited to degree-seeking students. (Figure 8.2)

8C3 - The percent of headcount graduate students enrolled at an institution who are minority according to federal reporting definitions. (Figure 8.3) This part does not apply to two-year branches of USC and the technical colleges.

8C4 - The percent of headcount teaching faculty who are minority. (Figure 8.4)


All institutions are measured on this indicator. Standards of achievement were developed based on Census population data. Additional information on these measures, including specific scoring ranges for individual institutions for Indicator 8C, can be found either in the Performance Funding Workbook or in individual institutional Report Cards linked in Section 11.

Figure 8.1 – 8C1, Percentage of Headcount Undergraduate Students who are Citizens of SC who are Minority
Source: IPEDS


Research and Teaching Institutions, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002

In defining the standard for “Achieves” for the research and teaching institutions, the state’s population is considered. The standard set for these institutions in Year 7 is being within 75% to 100% of the overall state percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18, 28.7%, as estimated from US Census data in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions for Year 7 is 21% to 28% minority population. Higher percentages score “Exceeds.”

Research Institutions




Teaching Institutions



Two-Year Branches of USC, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002

The standard set for a score of “Achieves” for these institutions is defined by the percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18 in their service area, as estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions, based on being within 75% of the service area minority population percentage, is unique to each. As a result, institutional comparisons cannot be made based solely on this chart. Specific institutional standards on this indicator can be found in the institution’s report card, linked in Chapter 11.



Technical College System, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 The standard set for a score of “Achieves” for these institutions is defined by the percentage of minority citizens above the age of 18 in their service area, as estimated by the US Census Bureau in 1998. The range for “Achieves” for these institutions, based on being within 75% of the service area minority population percentage, is unique to each. As a result, institutional comparisons cannot be made based solely on this chart. Specific institutional standards on this indicator can be found in the institution’s report card, linked in Chapter 11.







Figure 8.2 – 8C2, Retention of Minorities who are SC Citizens and Identified as Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students

Source: IPEDS


Research Institutions, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 5% of the median overall student retention for all of the state’s 4-yr institutions. A median retention rate of 83.0% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2001 cohort in Fall 2002 for SC’s research and teaching universities. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 78.0 to 87.0%.



Teaching Institutions, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 5% of the median overall student retention of the state’s teaching institutions. A median retention rate of 78.8% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2001 cohort in Fall 2002 for SC’s teaching universities. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 74.0 to 82.0%.



Two-Year Branch Campuses of USC, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 10% of the median overall student retention of the state’s regional campuses. A median retention rate of 52.7% is the reference and represents median retention of the 1998 cohort in Fall 1999 for SC’s regional campuses. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 47.0 to 57.0%.



Technical Colleges, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 The standard for these institutions for this measure is based on +/- 10% of the median overall student retention of the state’s technical campuses. A median retention rate of 55.4% is the reference and represents median retention of the 2001 cohort in Fall 2002 for SC’s regional campuses. The range for a score of “Achieves” is 49.0 to 60.0%.






Figure 8.3 – 8C3, Percentage of Headcount Graduate Students Enrolled at the Institution who are Minority

Source: IPEDS

Research and Teaching Institutions, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002 –The standard for this indicator is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees. The reference used is 12% US minority population based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” is 10 – 13 %. This part of Indicator 8C does not apply to the two-year branches of USC or the technical colleges, which do not have equivalent programs.

Research



Teaching





Figure 8.4 – 8C4, Percentage of Headcount Teaching Faculty who are Minority

Source: IPEDS


Research Institutions, Teaching Institutions, and Regional Campuses, Fall 2000 – Fall 2002

“Teaching faculty” includes all those except graduate students who teach one or more credit courses in the Fall schedule. The standard for these three sectors is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with graduate degrees. The reference used is 11.9% US minority population with master’s and higher degrees based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” for all three of these sectors is 10 to 13%.


Research Institutions





Teaching Institutions



Regional Campuses of USC




Technical Colleges – The standard for this indicator is based on being at or within +/- 10% of US minority population with baccalaureate degrees. The reference used is 12.0% US minority population based on 1990 census data, “Educational attainment of persons 25 yrs and older.” The standard for a score of “Achieves” for this sector is 10 to 13%.



(blank page)

Section 9 Research Funding



(blank page)

RESEARCH FUNDING

Information on research data includes student involvement in research, grants and awards expended in support of teacher training, and public and private sector research grant expenditures. Tables 9.1 and 9.2 summarize the number and percent of upper-division, degree-seeking undergraduate and graduate students, respectively, funded through grants who participate in sponsored research. These data are reported as required by Act 255, as amended.

With regard to financial support for teacher training, Figure 9.1 displays expenditures by Clemson, USC Columbia, and the Teaching Sector institutions in the past year compared to the average of the previous three years for programs supporting teacher education. All institutions show an increase in such funding above the three-year average. These data are used in performance funding **Indicator 9A, Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education**.

Figure 9.2 displays institutional performance on **Indicator 9B – Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants**, the expenditures of dollars from public and private research grants of the three research institutions in the most recent ended fiscal year compared to the average of similar expenditures for the prior three fiscal years. **This indicator was deferred for Performance Year 7** due to changes in federal accounting practices which make data comparisons to previous years impossible. A revised measure is under consideration.

Student Involvement in Research

The following tables (9.1 and 9.2) summarize the number and percentage of degree-seeking upper-division undergraduate and graduate students who have received funding through grant monies and thus have participated in sponsored research activities. It should be noted that many students who participate in non-sponsored research, or in externally funded projects which are not classified as research, are not reflected in the data presented below.

Table 9.1 Student Involvement in Research – Graduate Students
Source: CHEMIS Data and Institutional IE Reports

Graduate Involvement in Research						
Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Graduate Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
Research Universities						
Clemson	2000	2,798	475	17.0%		
	2001	2,748	555	20.2%	-50	80
	2002	2,778	638	23.0%	30	83
USC Columbia	2000	5,910	639	10.8%		
	2001	5,622	654	11.6%	-288	15
	2002	5,854	728	12.4%	232	74
MUSC	2000	883	205	23.2%		
	2001	844	179	21.2%	-39	-26
	2002	845	274	32.4%	1	95
Four-Year Colleges & Universities						
Citadel	2000	672	9	1.3%		
	2001	780	14	1.8%	108	5
	2002	817	9	1.1%	37	-5
Coastal Carolina	2000	37	0	0.0%		
	2001	30	0	0.0%	-7	0
	2002	56	0	0.0%	26	0
Coll. of Chas.	2000	476	17	3.6%		
	2001	510	22	4.3%	34	5
	2002	512	53	10.4%	2	31
Francis Marion	2000	283	0	0.0%		
	2001	268	0	0.0%	-15	0
	2002	237	0	0.0%	-31	0
Lander	2000	65	0	0.0%		
	2001	73	0	0.0%	8	0
	2002	69	0	0.0%	-4	0
SC State	2000	380	79	20.8%		
	2001	461	75	16.3%	81	-4
	2002	492	25	5.1%	31	-50

Graduate Involvement in Research

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Graduate Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
USC Aiken	2000	47	0	0.0%		
	2001	33	0	0.0%	-14	0
	2002	51	0	0.0%	18	0
USC Beaufort	2002	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
USC Spartanburg	2000	2	0	0.0%		
	2001	0	0	0.0%	-2	0
	2002	3	0	0.0%	3	0
Winthrop	2000	645	0	0.0%		
	2001	699	0	0.0%	54	0
	2002	694	1	0.1%	-5	1

Upper-Division, Degree-Seeking Undergraduate Students

Undergraduate students are also involved in research efforts at public institutions. Presented below are data reflecting the involvement of upper-division (junior and senior level) degree-seeking students in such research. Although the percentages are much lower, these students can make significant contributions to on-going research at these institutions.

Table 9.2 Student Involvement in Research – Undergraduate Students
Source: CHEMIS Data and Institutional IE Reports

Upper-division, Degree-seeking Undergraduate Involvement in Research

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Upper-division Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
Research Universities						
Clemson	2000	6,834	90	1.3%		
	2001	7,204	121	1.7%	370	31
	2002	7,450	101	1.4%	246	-20
USC Columbia	2000	7,597	53	0.7%		
	2001	7,336	52	0.7%	-261	-1
	2002	7,275	33	0.5%	-61	-19
MUSC	2000	405	26	6.4%		
	2001	400	17	4.3%	-5	-9
	2002	352	101	28.7%	-48	84
Four-Year Colleges & Universities						
Citadel	2000	814	28	3.4%		
	2001	833	28	3.4%	19	0

Upper-division, Degree-seeking Undergraduate Involvement in Research

Institution	Fall	Total Headcount Degree-seeking Upper-division Students Enrolled	Number Receiving Stipends for Research	% Participating in Research	Change Over Prior Year in Enrollment	Change Over Prior Yr in # of Students w/ Stipends
	2002	879	13	1.5%	46	-15
Coastal Carolina	2000	1,799	32	1.8%		
	2001	2,007	24	1.2%	208	-8
	2002	2,059	62	3.0%	52	38
Coll. of Chas.	2000	4,160	17	0.4%		
	2001	4,405	52	1.2%	245	35
	2002	4,694	359	7.6%	289	307
Francis Marion	2000	1,169	0	0.0%		
	2001	1,202	2	0.2%	33	2
	2002	1,158	6	0.5%	-44	4
Lander	2000	1,017	0	0.0%		
	2001	1,066	0	0.0%	49	0
	2002	1,157	0	0.0%	91	0
SC State	2000	1,700	158	9.3%		
	2001	1,618	156	9.6%	-82	-2
	2002	1,605	90	5.6%	-13	-66
USC Aiken	2000	1,380	5	0.4%		
	2001	1,349	8	0.6%	-31	3
	2002	1,494	22	1.5%	145	14
USC Beaufort	2002	170				
USC Spartanburg	2000	1,566	8	0.5%		
	2001	1,719	2	0.1%	153	-6
	2002	1,854	2	0.1%	135	0
Winthrop	2000	2,136	0	0.0%		
	2001	2,317	0	0.0%	181	0
	2002	2,485	2	0.1%	168	2

Financial Support for Teacher Education

In the 2001-2002 (Year 7) performance funding year, **Performance Indicator 9A – Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education** measured the amount of grants and awards expended to support teacher preparation or training, including applied research, professional development and training grants as compared to the average from the prior three years.

Figure 9.1 shows the comparison in actual dollar amounts from FY 02 as compared to the average of expenditures in FYs 99, 00 and 01. Effective with Year 6 (2001-02), the Commission approved a comparable measure for MUSC to reflect its status as a free-standing health sciences center. The measure assesses MUSC’s expenditures of grants/awards in support of the improvement of the health of preK-12th grade students. It was a compliance indicator in Year 6 and was scored for the first time

in Year 7. This measure does not apply to the Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC, or the Technical College sector.


Figure 9.1 – Financial Support for Reform in Teacher Education
Source: Institutional Reports to CHE

Performance for both sectors was assessed based on an “Achieves” range of 80 – 119% of the FY98, 98, 00 average.

**Research Universities -
 FY02 grants and awards divided by the Average of FY 99, 00, and 01.**


This chart displays the ratios of grants/awards expended on teacher education by the research universities in FY 02 to the average dollars of FY 99, 00, and 01.

*This was a new scored measure for MUSC in FY 02.
 The measure was based on FY02/FY01 expenditures, as defined in the Performance Funding Workbook, September 2002.



Four-Year Colleges and Universities, FY01 grants and awards divided by the Average of FY 98, 99, 00.

This chart displays the ratios of grants/awards expended on teacher education by the teaching universities in FY 01 to the average dollars of FY 98, 99, 00.



Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants

This indicator was deferred in Year 7 due to changes in federal accounting practices. In performance funding year years prior to Year 7, institutions were measured on **Performance Funding Indicator 9B – Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants** on current fiscal year grant expenditures divided by the average of grant expenditures from the prior three years. Data for this measure were the restricted research expenditures reported by institutions in fulfillment of federal reporting requirements of the IPEDS Finance Survey. "Grants" for purposes of this measure, are defined as the total dollars received from public and private sector grants expended in the State fiscal year for research, including federal and state research expenditures. This indicator only applies to research universities.


Figure 9.2 – Amount of Public and Private Sector Grants – Year 6 (2001-2002) Data
 Source: IPEDS Annual Finance Surveys

Research Universities

FY01 research grants and awards divided by the Average of FY 98, 99, 00.

This chart represents the FY research grant expenditures compared to the average of research grant expenditures from FY 98, 99, 00.


In Year 6, the range for a score “Achieves” was 104% -110% for Clemson, 110% -114% for USC Columbia, and 114% – 128% for MUSC.



01
of

Section 10

Campus-Based Assessment



(blank page)

CAMPUS-BASED ASSESSMENT

The institutions' summary reports reveal an active on-going process of assessment at institutions that was encouraged by legislative requirements, the Commission on Higher Education (CHE), the requirements for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools regional accreditation and also by some specialized accrediting bodies.

Section 59-104-660 (B) of the South Carolina Code of Laws, 1976, as amended, requires that as part of each public post-secondary institution's annual report to the CHE on institutional achievement, each institution must report on progress in developing assessment programs and on related information on student achievement. During 1997-98, the CHE streamlined reporting requirements in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication in reporting and to ensure reporting of data consistent with requirements of Act 359 of 1996.

Many of the components listed below are not reported annually, but based on a pre-determined and approved schedule submitted by each institution. However, the assessment of these components is an on-going process.

The summary reports for 2001-2002 were submitted electronically and are available through each institution's website at the addresses that follow this summary. They can also be found through the CHE website. The reports include the following components:

General Education

The goals of general education, which is one of the most difficult components of curriculum to assess, may be defined narrowly in terms of basic skills or extremely broadly to include understanding and integrating knowledge spanning the full range of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences combined with attitudes and behaviors which enable the graduate to function effectively in today's complex society. In their assessment plans, institutions were asked to provide their definitions of general education, to indicate the methodologies for instruments they selected to assess the effectiveness of their general education, to list major findings or trends from their initial assessments, and to describe actions they have taken or plan to take to improve their general education programs as a result of the assessment process. While efforts to assess this component vary both in their complexity and their success, many institutions have already obtained findings that either reinforce what they are currently doing in their programs or enable them to make appropriate changes or improvements.

Majors or Concentrations

Majors or concentrations provide students with specialized knowledge and skills. Because of the vast number of majors offered, institutions generally report on all of them over a four-year cycle. In their assessment plans for their majors, institutions are asked to list the majors on which they are reporting, to describe the various methods that are being used to assess each major and to highlight the findings and how they are being used for improvement. Examples of assessment methods being used by South Carolina's public institutions include both commercial and locally-developed tests; portfolios; internal and external peer reviews; capstone courses; results of licensing and certification examinations; exit interviews; focus groups; student, graduate and employer surveys; classroom research; and matrix analysis of curriculum content. Many reports describe significant changes that are being made in curriculum and teaching effectiveness as a result of the assessment of majors.

Academic Advising

Academic Advising provides students with an understanding of their rights and responsibilities for completion of their degrees, programs and/or career preparation. Reports typically include information on student evaluations of services, special programs, changes, and student usage.

Achievement of Students Transferring from Two to Four Year Institutions

Two-year public institutions report on this component every other year, when data on the academic performance of their former students are transferred from the four-year institutions back to the two-year institutions for examination and analysis. This report is included in the institutions’ 2002 Institutional Effectiveness reports.

Procedures for Student Development

Determining student growth and development throughout the college or university experience requires the application of multiple assessment procedures. All institutions were asked to assess their student services (e.g., financial aid, orientation, counseling, residence halls, and extracurricular activities) although some have chosen to cycle those assessments over several reporting years. Reports typically include descriptions of the services that have been evaluated, major findings, and any changes or improvements that have been made as a result of the assessments. In addition, most institutions are conducting pilot studies on the institutions’ effect on their students’ attitudes and behaviors, particularly as those attitudes affect academic and career success. While difficult to design, such studies respond to institutional mission statements that indicate intent to instill such values as civic responsibility, tolerance, cultural sensitivity, and ethical behavior.

Library Resources and Services

Access to and use of appropriate library materials is a critical part of the learning process. In their summary reports, institutions indicate the results of assessments of their library services and collections. College and university librarians in South Carolina generally have done an outstanding job with these evaluations.

Please see the information below to obtain summary reports and the pre-approved reporting schedule for each institution.

2003 Summary Reports on Institutional Websites

Research Universities

- Clemson <http://www.clemson.edu/reports/chereport.pdf>
- USC Columbia <http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/IEReports/iereprts.htm>
- MUSC http://www.edserv.musc.edu/musc_ie_report_02/index.html

Four-Year Colleges and Universities

- Citadel http://www.citadel.edu/planningandassessment/inst_eff02/contents.html
- College of Charleston <http://www.cofc.edu/~oap/2002/ierpt02.pdf>
- Coastal Carolina <http://www.coastal.edu/effect/internal%20reports/iereport02.html>
- Francis Marion <http://www.fmarion.edu/~instresearch/2002ie.htm>
- Lander http://www.lander.edu/ir/institutional_effectiveness_report.htm
- SC State <http://www.scsu.edu/testsite/ir/IE/IE-2002.htm>
- USC Aiken <http://assess.usca.sc.edu/ira/assessment/IEreport2002.htm>

USC Beaufort*	http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/IEReports/beau2002.doc
USC Spartanburg	http://www.uscs.edu/about_uscs/ir/archived/ie/ie03.htm
Winthrop	http://www.winthrop.edu/acad_aff/IE/

Two-Year Institutions-Branches of USC

All 4 Campuses	http://kudzu.ipr.sc.edu/IEReports/iereprts.htm
----------------	---

State Technical and Comprehensive Education System


Aiken	http://www.atc.edu/acrobat/020805_2002iereports.pdf
Central Carolina	http://www.cctech.edu/about/effective.asp
Denmark	http://www.den.tec.sc.us/iereport.htm
Florence-Darlington	http://www.fdtc.edu/Gen_Info/IE_Rpt/IE_Rpt2002.htm
Greenville	http://www.greenvilletech.com/About/institution.html
Horry-Georgetown	http://www.hor.tec.sc.us/ir/
Midlands	http://www.midlandstech.com/arp/ACCOUNT.HTM
Northeastern	http://www.netc.edu/IEReports.html
Orangeburg-Calhoun	http://www.octech.edu/about/IESummary.html
Piedmont	http://www.piedmont.tec.sc.us/ie/reports_to_CHE.htm
Spartanburg	http://www.stcsc.edu/Institut_Effectiv_Sum/default.htm
Tech of Lowcountry	http://www.tclonline.org/
Tri-County	http://www.tricounty.tec.sc.us/instdev/2002.html
Trident	http://www.tridenttech.edu/ir/
Williamsburg	http://www.williamsburgtech.com/IEReport.html
York	http://www.yorktech.com/CHE/REPORTS/CHE2002IE.htm

*USC Beaufort was approved in 2002 to change its mission and status to “Four-Year Teaching Institution.”

(blank page)

Section 11 Institutional Performance Ratings

(Performance Year 7, 2002-2003
impacting FY 2003-2004)



(blank page)

INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Institutional performance ratings from 2002-2003 are displayed on the CHE website for each of South Carolina's public institutions of higher education. These ratings impacted each institution's FY 2003-2004 state funding. The format for displaying ratings is described below.

Beginning with Year 6, institutions are rated on a reduced set of indicators (13 or 14) that were selected for each sector to represent those most closely tied to its mission. The reduced set of indicators better focuses the system and reduces redundancy among the indicators. In reducing the number of measures impacting institutional scores, several indicator definitions were revised. This year three institutions, the Medical University of SC, USC Columbia, and Winthrop University were rated in the "Substantially Exceeds" category. As for the other institutions, 16 performed in the "Exceeds" category and 14 in the "Achieves" category. The overall average performance score of institutions in Year 7 was 2.60 of 3.0, higher than the average of 2.51 of 3.0 in Year 6.

Note on Report Format: The ratings are posted as Adobe Acrobat files, with four pages for each institution. The first page provides a summary of overall performance and details about the institution itself including president's name and contact information as well as "quick facts" including enrollment, type degrees offered, faculty and financial data. The pages that follow provide indicator-by-indicator performance details including current and three years of historical data for each indicator

The reader is cautioned against drawing comparisons between institutions in light of individual or overall performance scores due to the nature of the performance funding system employed in South Carolina. It should be kept in mind that there are differences in indicator definitions as well as differences in the applicability of indicators across sectors and institutions that make comparisons difficult. Also, as the reader will note, there is a great deal of variability across all institutions and within sectors as a portion of the institutions' scores result from a measurement of annual institutional progress. Thus, under South Carolina's performance funding system, the institution is largely in competition with itself and not with other institutions. As reflected on the rating sheets for each institution, those performing within the same overall performance category may be considered as performing similarly for purposes of allocating fiscal year appropriations.

2002-2003 INSTITUTIONAL REPORT CARDS

http://www.che.sc.gov/Finance/Perf_Fund/Perform/ReportCards/03_Institutional_Performance_Rating_Index.htm